LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 5 1944
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LA126
.M613
v. 1

To Abe Willensky
front row — Shakespeare.

Sincerely
Adolph E Meyer Jr
1.22.34

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 5 1944
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

EDUCATION IN MODERN TIMES

UP FROM ROUSSEAU

By Adolph E. Meyer, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor of Education,
New York University

THE AVON PRESS
New York
1930

Copyright by The Avon Press
1930

PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

FOR THE AVON PRESS

BY HICKEY & KISCHEL PTG. AND BDG. CO., INC., NEW YORK CITY

To Herman Harrell Horne

Teacher, Colleague, Friend

PREFACE

The following pages are frankly intended as a personal answer to a personal need. As a collegiate pedagogue, dealing in the history of education, I have for some years been faced with the formidable task of teaching within the confines of one brief semester the main landmarks in the vast pedagogical acres that stretch from the days of the French Revolution down to the present era. The available texts in the field, I confess, weren't of much help. Most of them plunge into their narrative with a recitation of the doings of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, and haul up to a stop when they reach the days that just preceded the blood-letting of the late war. Such studies that handle the modern scene with all its postwar trappings are, in the very nature of things, specialized jobs, and hence they don't waste much time on the prewar details except in so far as these actually color the postwar situation. Such opera, obviously, are not for the general student. No single work, as far as I know, covers the area which has been traversed in the present study. The usual final chapter of the average tome dealing with modern educational trends, I have omitted. Why? Well, primarily because I can't convince myself that the contemporary pedagogical stream can be bottled and stored away in a single chapter. Present trends, I am inclined to feel, need more space, and hence I have consecrated the whole second volume of this study to their depiction.

A. E. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I.

ROUSSEAU

Early Life—His Writings—Nature is Right—*Emile*—Book One—Book Two—Book Three—Book Four—The Education of Sophie—Inconsistence of Rousseau—Rousseau's Influence 3

CHAPTER II.

BASEDOW

Early Life—Early Education—University Study—A Private Tutor—Soroë—Altona—An Address to Philanthropists—The *Methodenbuch* and the *Elementarwerk*—The *Philanthropinum*—Basedow's Pedogagy—Basedow's Influence 27

CHAPTER III.

PESTALOZZI

Early Life—His Early Education and Ideals—Law—Neuhof—The *Emile* Influence—His Early Writings—The Influence of *Leonard and Gertrude*—Stanz—Burgdorf—Yverdon—The Pestalozzi Contribution—Pestalozzi's Influence 44

PAGE

CHAPTER IV.

HERBART

Early Life—Jena—A Private Tutor—Göttingen—Königsberg—His Educational Principles—Interest—Apperception—The Formal Steps—Correlation—Herbart's Followers—Pestalozzi and Herbart—The Herbartian Influence 73

CHAPTER V.

FROEBEL

Early Life—Training and Education—From Surveyor to Schoolmaster—Yverdon—Berlin, Army, Institute—Burgdorf and Blankenburg—His Last Years The Froebelian Pedagogy—The Kindergarten—The Froebelian Influence—Manual Training—Froebel's Influence Outside of Germany 91

CHAPTER VI.

SPENCER

Science in the Nineteenth Century—Science and the Classics—Herbert Spencer—What Knowledge is of Most Worth—Some Spencerian Principles—Spencer's Influence 108

PAGE

CHAPTER VII.

GERMANY

Beginnings of Public Education—Frederick the Great and the Schools—The *Oberschulkollegium* and the Code of 1794—Reforms after Jena—Reaction—The Period of Nationalism—Prewar Elementary Education—Prewar Secondary Education—Girls' Secondary Education—Some Other Prewar Schools—The German Constitution of 1919—The Religious Question—Some Contemporary Schools—The Higher Learning 121

CHAPTER VIII.

FRANCE

The Early Nineteenth Century—The Napoleonic Influence—Reaction under Louis XVIII—Progress under Louis-Philippe—The Law of 1833—Up to the Third Republic—Educational Reforms of the Third Republic—Organization of French Education—Elementary Education—Advanced Primary Schools—Secondary Schools—Postwar Education—The Higher Learning 148

CHAPTER IX.

ENGLAND

Late Development of Secularized Education—The Charity School System—The Sunday Schools—Lancaster and Bell and their Monitorial System—The Monitorial System of Instruction—Influence of the Monitorial System—The Infant School—The Early Nineteenth Century—The Elementary Education Act of 1870—The Education Act of 1902—Elementary Education in 1914—Secondary Education in 1914—The Fisher Act of 1918—Up from the Fisher Act—The English Higher Learning 172

CHAPTER X.

THE UNITED STATES

The Religious Motive—The Puritans—Early Interest in Education—The Massachusetts Law of 1642—The Law of 1647—The Decline of New England Education—Education in the Middle Colonies—Education in Virginia—The Transitional Period—Public Money to Private Schools—Sectarianism—Other Obstacles to Public Education—Movements Favorable to the Development of Public Education—The Public School Revival—Horace Mann—Henry Barnard—Revival's Influence—Up from the Civil War 198

PAGE

CHAPTER XI.

ITALY

The Development of a State System of Education—Elementary Education in 1914—Prewar Secondary Education—The Need of Educational Reform—The Gentile Reform—Modern Elementary Education—Modern Secondary Education—The Lyceum for Girls—The Higher Learning—Hygiene and Physical Training—The Vatican Agreements 232

CHAPTER XII.

RUSSIA

The Development of Education—Organization of Prewar Education—Prewar Elementary Education—Prewar Secondary Education—Prewar Secondary Education for Girls—Prewar Technical and Commercial Schools—The Plight of Prewar Education—Education in Soviet Russia 248

Part One

PEDAGOGUES AND THEORIES

Chapter One

ROUSSEAU

EARLY LIFE.—When Jean Jacques Rousseau referred to his birth in Geneva in 1712 as his first misfortune, he may, as many hard-hearted critics maintain, have been striving for rhetorical effect. Yet if the birth of an infant costing the life of its mother may be called a bad blow from fate, then certainly Rousseau is fully entitled to his striking phrase. For as the baby Rousseau came into life his exhausted mother reluctantly left it. With her demise, the training of the lad was thrust upon the father who, however, never particularly relished or understood this intricate and delicate job. An aunt was made to collaborate with Rousseau, *père,* but as a worthy and effective rearer of young Jean Jacques she, too, was far from capable. Neither the aunt nor the father had much positive effect on the boy, who at the end of some half dozen years of life had no doubt acquired more vices than virtues. It was during this early period, however, that the youngster, by staying up nights with his dad and reading through piles of sentimental rubbish, acquired a liking for books. By the time he entered his second decade young Rousseau, undisciplined and barely tutored, went into the world to learn a trade. For four years he tried his hand at various vocations, but none of these proved very much to his liking. Indeed, versed as he was in lying and pilfering, and preferring a life of ease to one of toil, young Rousseau sought less strenuous ways of gaining his bread than the ones usually connected with a trade. For his high-powered imagination, moreover, Geneva was much too straight-laced and confining, and so one day when the call of the road became particularly potent, Rousseau quietly slipped out of his distinguished birth-town.

The next few years he treked through Savoy, living, like most professional hoboes, by his wits rather than by his work. Finally he gravitated to the home of Mrs. de Warens, a woman more noted for her beauty than her morals. Through the influence of Mrs. de Warens, as well as the wine and food contributed by a proselyting priest at Confignon, Rousseau in his early teens exchanged his Calvinian dogmas for those of Rome. [1] The influence of the beauteous Mrs. de Warens, however, was more than merely religious. For a decade young Jean Jacques lived with her, devouring a good slice of her scanty pension, and becoming privy, through her insistence, to the intricacies of music, philosophy, Latin, and what then passed for science. But by 1741 Rousseau appears to have become fed up with this sort of life. At all events, he quit his gifted patroness and struck out for Paris. Here he managed to make a political connection which pulled him to Venice as secretary to one of the French diplomats. Three years later he was back in the French capital and was admitted to the distinguished circle of Diderot and the Encyclopedists. It was at this time, too, that he met Thérèse Levasseur, a silly and inconsequential female, with whom he entered into a sort of companionate scheme. Out of this union came five children, all of whom, curiously enough, the incomparable Rousseau donated to a home for foundlings. After the bond with Thérèse had run 23 years, her husband finally decided to make it permanent in a regular way, and thus in 1768 he bestowed upon his consort the rank and name of Mrs. Rousseau.

---

[1] Rousseau did not, as is well known, remain a permanent devotee of the Roman rite. His eventual faith was deism.

His Writings.—Though he had taken several serious flings at the business of writing, it wasn't until 1750 that Rousseau plucked fame for the first time in this territory. This, as is well known, was when he composed his celebrated essay in answer to the question propounded by the Dijon academicians, as to whether the progress of the sciences and arts had helped to corrupt or purify morals. [2] His argument, eloquent and devastating, heaved the blame for social corruption into the face of advancing civilization. Though veering at times into strange logic, Rousseau's harangue was potent enough to romp off with the Dijon prize. Much more important than the gold and honor thus snared, however, is the fact that the 38-year-old Genevan for the first time in his life was basking in the spotlight of the world—a place which he was to hold anon on several occasions, and which, as everyone knows, has today become permanent. Three years after the Dijon contest, Rousseau entered the literary arena for another prize. Firing off another terrific and beautiful philippic on the human race, the ex-Genevan now expounded on the origin and foundations of human inequality. [3] However, though his essay is filled to the brim with plenty of vigor and new ideas, it failed somehow to lift the judges. Now Rousseau turned his pen on beautiful letters, and the result, which appeared in 1760, was *The New Heloise,* a novel which in these days of hot and unadulterated realism would hardly make the grade, but which in its own era effected considerable heart-pounding and excitement. Just two years after the *Heloise* was flung into print, Rousseau scaled the heights with a brace of immortal works. One of these was the *Social Contract* which became part of the dynamite that touched off the French Revolution and blasted the old regime to atoms. The other book was *Emile,* a treatise on education so startling in its main contentions, that the intellectual Immanuel Kant found it the only thing that ever kept him from his daily promenade which had become so regular that people set their clocks by it.

---

[2] *Si le progrès des sciences et des arts a contribué à corrompre ou à épurer les moeurs.*

[3] *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes.*

NATURE IS RIGHT.—"Everything," says Rousseau in his *Emile,* "is good as it comes from the hands of the Author of Nature; but everything degenerates in the hands of man." Or, putting the whole thing in its essence, *nature is right.* This doesn't mean however, that Rousseau was in accord with such savants of his day as Saint-Lambert, Diderot, and squadrons of others, all of whom contended that nature is simply another term for animal desire. Rousseau believed no such nonsense. For him animal desire merely played a part in nature. Reason and conscience played much more weighty roles, since theirs was the job of keeping animal desire in the background and under control. Nor did Rousseau mean, as Voltaire and hosts of minor critics have often maintained, that the only way to be natural was to be a savage. For Rousseau a tax-payer of celebrated Geneva had just as much chance of living a natural life, *in his particular way and environment,* as a Redskin chasing the bison on the plains of America. Nor was this Swiss devotee of nature, when he bawled for the supremacy of nature, opposed to men's art. Plainly, the right kind of art could be turned into nature's most helpful handmaiden. Manuring a plant, giving it moisture, sunlight, and space—all samples of the right kind of art—actually help nature to carry out her original idea on a grander and better scale. On the other hand, trimming a shrub in the fantastic style of an Italian landscaper, bobbing a dog's tail, or clipping a horse's ears, are all examples of the wrong kind of art, for such debaucheries hinder the carrying out of nature's private intentions. All of which amounts to saying that man is on the right track as long as he lives the way nature meant him to—a principle as easy to announce as a political platform, but just as sadly difficult to enforce.

As far as education is concerned, the corollaries oozing out of Rousseau's dictum that nature is right, are simple enough. Human nature, argued the Geneva savant, at bottom is good, and despite the array of testimony offered by the reverend clergy, original sin is a plain and downright fraud.

Nor is there such a monster as total depravity. If the child at birth naturally is good, then everything contributed to that child by nature is good. Did nature intend the infant to develop freely? Then why hinder it with indiotic and unnatural restrictions? Plainly, the right sort of education ought to be that kind which permits a youngster to grow into the sort of an adult that nature intended at the outset. And equally plainly, no one is ever in a position to determine precisely what nature's intentions are for any specific individual. Hence, the best education is a *laissez-faire* variety, the brand which, curiously enough, is held in high esteem by the very up-to-date pedagogues today, and which for its main program proposes that a child's education should permit him to express his own peculiar nature, capacities, and inclinations.

EMILE.—To put these ideas on a more specific basis Rousseau wrote *Emile*. That the book might have limitations even its author, confident though he is, is perfectly willing to admit:

> I demurred a long while over publishing the book . . . but after vain efforts to make it better I believe I ought to print it as it is . . . and though my own notions may be erroneous, I shall not have lost my time if I inspire better ones in others. I may be wrong about the means to use, but I think I am right about the end to aim for.

Three Teachers
nature, experience,
observation and
contact with man
nature, things,
man

Divided into five books, which trace education from early infancy to youth, *Emile* is launched with a restatement of some of Rousseau's main ideas about nature. There are, so states Rousseau, three distinct types of education or "teachers." Just growing up, letting our bodies and all our powers develop, letting nature have its own way, is one type of education. Then there is the education we pluck from the things about us, things which teach us that ice is cold, that hills are steep, that water is wet, and so on. Finally, there is the education we get from men. Over the first sort of education we have no control; over the second, very little; but over the third, a great deal. Complete education, as always, requires co-operation. In the case of Rousseau this means a working co-operation of his educative trinity—nature, things, and man. Or to put it in the Genevan's own phrases: "Since the co-operation of the three educations is necessary for their perfection, it is to the one over which we have no control (nature) that we must direct the other two." Education, in brief, must conform to nature. The educational result must be "the natural man."

> What now is necessary to be done to educate the natural man? . . . The child should be educated for the human vocation, not for any special situation; he must merely live, in good or evil, as life should bring them; and should learn more by experience then by

> teaching. Considering the instability of human affairs, and the restless, rebellious spirit of the present century . . . no more unnatural method of education could be devised than that which deals with a child as if he were never to leave home or the companionship of his own friends. As soon as the unhappy pupil has gone a step away, he is lost.

BOOK ONE.—Book One of *Emile* deals, as I have hinted, with the period of infancy during which there can be very little positive instruction. Our main job from the moment the youngster is born is to see that he follows nature's commands. Does the new-born babe bawl for food? Then let his mother nurse him. Does the child crave activity? Then away with the imbecility of long, uncomfortable, and cumbersome garments. Let the child be a healthy, active animal. Let him develop his muscles and his senses. Let his training and growth be as spontaneous as possible. Let him avoid the medicoes and their prescriptions "unless his life is in evident danger; for they can do nothing worse than kill him." Habits, curiously enough, should not be formed in this period since they are contrary to impulse and hence unnatural. "The only habit" contends the creator of *Emile,* "which the child should be allowed to form is to contract no habit whatsoever." The child's toys shouldn't be costly and gaudy gew-gaws whose main appeal is to the adult who buys them, but simple products of nature, such as "branches with their fruits and flowers, or a poppy-head wherein the seeds are heard to rattle." In all this early education nature holds the prompt-book, and the best stage to run off the training is the country and not the over-civilized city.

Book Two.—Taking up the educational burdens where Book One leaves off, Book Two maps out a plan for Emile's education. Our main job during this period, it appears, is still in the realm of physical training. "Develop the body," commands Master Rousseau, "and keep the soul fallow, for in order to think we must exercise our limbs, our senses, and our organs which are the instruments of intelligence." Here, curiously enough, Rousseau is quite in step with some of the most up-to-date ideas on the subject. Thus he makes Emile don short, loose, and scanty raiment. Even hats and caps are on the pedagogical blacklist. To develop physically, the boy is made privy to the high art of swimming. He becomes an expert hiker unafraid of hills and bad roads. Not only the muscles are trained, however, but also the senses. With this in mind Emile lifts weights and measures distances. To train the eye and the hand he takes up drawing, using what he perceives in nature as his models. To train the ear he resorts to singing.

During this period the formal subjects are banned. There is no history, no literature, no geography. All these, as is well known, demand at least a bit of reasoning on the part of the pupil, and this power according to Rousseau, is still mainly absent. Fables, though highly commended to pedagogues by the illustrious John Locke, leave Rousseau quite cold. To the youngster, though he may recite them glibly enough, fables are often thoroughly ununderstandable, and hence Rousseau tosses them out. Reading, too, goes down the chute:

> Reading is the scourge of childhood, and almost the sole occupation that we know how to give them (i.e., the children). At the age of twelve Emile will hardly know what a book is. But I shall be told that it is necessary for him to know how to read. This I grant. It is necessary for him to know how to read when reading is useful to him. Until then, it serves only to annoy him.

Education during this second period, obviously enough, is mainly negative. Not that Emile has nothing to do. Certainly if the boy is true to the Rousseau program he will have little chance to loaf. He is, however, deliberately kept in the dark about rafts of things which youngsters of that day were commonly taught. Believing that ignorance is better than error, Rousseau prefers to teach certain matters only when the child is ready to understand them. "Treat your child according to his age," and "Let children be children," are two of his favorite maxims. Even in morals no deliberate training is to be given during this second period, for until Emile "reaches the age of reason he can form no idea of moral beings or social relations." Until Emile is old enough to understand moral precepts, he is to learn through "natural consequences." Does he smash a window? Then let him sit in the draught and become privy to the results of his deed. Does he dig up the neighbor's melons and plant beans in their stead? Then let the neighbor pull up the beans, and teach the boy the meaning of private property. Never haul out the birch. Never scold. Instead, let the child suffer the natural consequences of his own acts.

Book Three.—The third period of Emile's education spans the years twelve to fifteen. These years, so Rousseau hints, have been appointed by nature "as the time of labor, instruction, and study." For the first time in his young life the boy has more strength than he actually needs. Hence there comes a lull in Emile's physical and sensory education, and some time is now given to running down the mysteries of knowledge. Only "useful knowledge," however, is to be pursued, and the hunt for this is to be guided all along the line by Emile's natural desires. The heaviest stress is put upon the sciences, but knowledge of these is to be garnered not vicariously from the textbooks, but directly by experience. Emile, it appears, "is not to learn science but to discover it." In the study of geography, for example, globes, atlases, and such well-known academic paraphernalia are flung upon the rubbish pile as pedagogically useless. Emile is to become cognizant of the charms and secrets of geography, first by studying his immediate environment, and then proceeding gradually to other scenes and territories. To interpret the experience thus gained, Emile is to produce his own maps. The study of astronomy is launched by having Emile observe a first-rate sunrise, which by its gaudy glory and general behavior is to make the boy lust for further experiences in the astronomical domain. Electricity, curiously enough, is introduced to Emile's consideration through the operations of a juggler who catches metal ducks with an unrevealed magnet. In all these fields of learning Emile is never to be furnished with instruments. If he needs them, and wants them badly enough, then let him make them himself. Rude as such creations may be, they will mean more to Emile than the most lavish specimens obtainable in the shops.

Though this third period of Emile's life is consecrated to learning, books are still under the ban, and Rousseau continues to roar against them much in the indignant mien of a retired cavalry captain bawling against disarmament. "I hate books," writes this Genevan man of learning: "they merely teach us to talk of what we do not know." One *opus,* however, does manage to snare a dispensation even from the cautious Rousseau. This is *Robinson Crusoe.* The sole reading material deemed fit for Emile's consumption during this period, *Robinson Crusoe,* passes inspection because it is the one tome, "where all the natural needs of man are exhibited in a manner obvious to the mind of a child, and where the means of providing for these needs are successively developed with the same facility."

Up to the age of twelve, the training of Emile, as is obvious, has been purely along individual lines. Alone with his tutor for most of the time, the boy has gathered none of those mysterious, modern delights known as Group Contacts. Thus Emile is a rank ignoramus when it comes to understanding his fellow-men, their doings and relations. Taking a somewhat different tack, Emile's education now veers slightly toward the social. Beginning, as usual, in the simplest way, Emile goes forth among the toilers of the world. Here he observes the interplay of industry and notes how men, at bottom, are interdependent. Society takes on the air of a vast

trade of man
cabinet-making

congeries of humans, each of whom must bear a definite part in the common social bond. Plainly, the aim here is not moral. Emile is to learn something about life and its weighty social role. For this reason Rousseau has his disciple learn a trade. Preference is given to the craft of cabinet-making, which—so the Geneva sage maintains— is "nearest the state of nature." Thus vocationally equipped, Emile will be saved from ruin economically, since he is able to earn his own bread. Socially, he is in a better condition to understand something about the meaning of the dignity of work. And educationally, he has of course added several valuable skills to his repertoire.

Book Four.—Dealing with Emile's education from his fifteenth to his eighteenth years, Book Four handles the difficult period of adolescence. During these three short years much is to be done:

> This critical time, though very short, has lasting influence. Here is the second birth of which I have spoken; it is here that man really begins to live, and nothing human is foreign to him. So far our cares have been but child's play; it is only now that they assume a real importance. This epoch, where ordinary education ends, is properly one where ours ought to begin.

If the boy has learned something about the interdependence of man, the motive, as I have hinted, has been mainly personal. Now, however, since

Sympathy for man

Emile "really begins to live," the boy's social training takes on a deeper hue. "We have formed his body, his senses, and his intelligence," asserts Rousseau; "it remains to give him a heart." Specifically, this means that Emile must learn the art of living with his fellows. He is, in brief, to be turned into a sympathetic, moral, and religious specimen of *homo sapiens*. As usual, Emile is to arrive at his goal mainly through experience rather than instruction. Thus he is made to mingle with his fellows. But this association with the human race is to start not at the top with royalty, admirals, millionaires, and such lofty amphibians. No. Such contacts, charming though they may be, are dangerous, for no matter how sensible Emile has become, they will tend to fire him with envy and an insatiable thirst for power and grandeur. If Emile is to become mellow and have sympathy for his fellows he must meet the common man in common circumstances. Especially must he know something about those poor wretches whom fortune has shoved down the chute. And so Rousseau dispatches his model pupil to hospitals and asylums, and even to jails. These, obviously, are first-rate training grounds for sympathy, a trait which in Emile is ultimately to evolve into a grandiose and rational benevolence.

This, too, is the time when Emile must learn something about human value. He must become privy to the causes of human inequality, and must know something of the vast part played by social predjudice in the shaping of human careers. Lest man's frauds and follies overwhelm Emile and thus convert him to cynicism, Rousseau now commends to his protégé the study of history. Of all the historical brethern, Thucydides appears to Emile's creator to be the best. Simple in style, Thucydides never plunges into the puerilities of Herodotus. Nor does he jazz his facts in the manner of such historical mountebanks as Sallust and Polybius. But the study of history, at best, is loaded with perils. For one thing, it roars entirely too much about the unusual. It serves up wars and struts forth kings, but tells nothing of the men and affairs of every day. Like Carlyle in a later day, Rousseau concludes that the cream of history is biography, and of all the biographers then known to the Genevan, Plutarch looms as the champion and most worthy of Emile's consideration.

If Rousseau once hurled his bull against the study of fables, he is now quite willing to relent. Maturer and more sensible, Emile is now safe from being trapped into wrong conclusions. Fables, indeed, "by censuring the wrongdoer under an unknown mask . . . instruct without offending him (*i.e.* Emile)." The time for fables and history, is the time for art and beautiful letters and the development of taste. It is the time, too, for social science—and here Emile is served with the main substance of the *Social Contract.* And finally, it is also the time for ethics, metaphysics, and religion.

"In his fifteenth year," says Rousseau, "Emile does not yet know that he has a soul; and perhaps he will find it out too early in his eighteenth." And thus:

> A child, it is said, must be brought up in the religion of his father; and he must be taught that this alone is true; and that others are absurd. But if the power of this instruction extends only so far as the country wherein it is given, and depends only on authority, for which Emile has been taught to have no regard, what then? In what religion shall we educate him?

The answer to this weighty question is simple enough: "In none. We will only put him in a condition to choose for himself that to which the best use of his own reason may bring him." To put Emile in this condition, Rousseau relates to the boy that famous *Profession of Faith* of the Savoyard Vicar which is a bravura exposition of Rousseau's natural religion, or deism. Says the Vicar:

> I perceive God everywhere in his works; I feel him in myself; I see him universally around me. But when I fain would seek where he is, of what substance, he glides away from me, and my troubled soul discerns nothing. The less I can conceive him, the more I adore. I bow myself down, and say to him, O being of beings, I am because thou art; to meditate ceaselessly on thee

> by day and by night is to raise myself to my veritable source and fount.

THE EDUCATION OF SOPHIE.—With the end of Book Four the final curtain might very well be brought down, for whatever else Rousseau has to say takes the nature of an anti-climax, and in the main is dismal stuff. The last and fifth book is devoted to the education of Sophie who is to become Emile's mate Here, for once, Rousseau dons the robes of an educational Tory. A downright reactionary in the field of female education, the Genevan avers that

> the whole education of women ought to be relative to men. To please them, to be useful to them, to make themselves loved and honored by them, to educate them when young, to care for them when grown, to counsel them, to console them, to make life agreeable and sweet to them—these are the duties of women at all times, and what should be taught them from infancy.

Woman, in brief, is the servant of man, and everything she learns is to be measured by this yardstick. Develop her physique to make her attractive and charming. Make her strong and healthy so she may breed vigorous children. Teach her the mysteries of sewing, embroidery, designing, dancing, and singing, for proficiency therein will render her "agreeable and sweet" to her man. Let her not waste her time on such disciplines as philosophy and science. Let her major instead in the study of men. "She must," so Rousseau insists, "learn to penetrate their feelings through their conversation, their actions, their books, and their gestures . . ." Her religion, if she is married, should be that of her husband. And if perchance she has not yet snared a mate, then she "should have the religion of her mother." Naturally, her religious education under such conditions will differ vastly from that of Emile. Thus, instead of waiting for the arrival of her fifteenth birthday to discover that she has a soul, woman is to take no foolish chances, and so at a very tender age is thrust into an established and dogmatic religion.

All this, as I have hinted, is intrinsically and obviously ridiculous. Certainly, unlike a good portion of the rest of *Emile,* Rousseau's notions on the education of women have had no influence on subsequent days. Today they are as dead as the Hittite Empire.

INCONSISTENCE OF ROUSSEAU.—It has been duly noted by sedulous historians that Rousseau died in 1778, a recluse from society and virtually insane. A detail, perhaps, but not without its sardonic overtones. For, as in the case of Friedrich Nietzsche who also made his final exit mentally derailed, the foes of the great Swiss lost no time in trying to turn Rousseau's sad demise to their advantage. If the man died *non compos mentis,* so they bellowed, then traces of madness must have coursed in his veins long before the last curtain. Thus whatever he thought and wrote ought to be held gravely suspect. And in many ways, of course, they were able to adduce much and damnable testimony. For from the works of Rousseau inconsistencies radiate like heat from a stove. Even the Genevan's warmest devotees, I daresay, are at times hard pressed to explain away his strange and ludicrous contradictions. Was he sincere, for example, in the sort of education he prescribed in *Emile?* Or was he sincere when he planned a radically different brand for the boys of Poland? Was he sincere when he denounced private property? Or was he sincere when he worshipped it as a noble institution? Was he sincere when he bawled for individual freedom? Or was he sincere when he ranted for absolute submission to the state? Was he sincere when he pleaded for religious tolerance? Or was he sincere when he banished the atheists from his republic?

All these contradictions, and many others, I confess, are stumbling-blocks to criticism, and even so formidable a fellow as Voltaire was downed thereby. [4] The source of the whole difficulty, perhaps, lies in Rousseau's love of rhetoric. Rousseau was a poet, not a scientist. Like the lamented Anatole France, Rousseau liked to turn out well-made and striking phrases. If such phrases sometimes emerged from the pen as disgraceful lies, then what of it? The main thing, it appears, was that at least they were written in a first-rate style. Neat half-truths, as everyone knows, will often stick to the memory when all the pages of an explanatory context have passed into oblivion. Such a devastating uppercut, for example, as "the man who meditates is a degenerate animal," is seductive, and the temptation to remember it, like a headline, as the sum and substance of the Rousseau credo is difficult to put down.

---

[4] In Voltaire's copy of the *Savoyard Vicar* one finds written in the margin such conflicting outbursts as "varlet crammed with inconsistencies," "genius of philosophic reasoning," "rag of metaphysic floating in the sunshine of sentimentalism," "the fairest spiritual creed the world has ever seen," and so on.

ROUSSEAU'S INFLUENCE.—If Rousseau was right when he contended that his *Emile* didn't fetch the attention it deserved, then as I have hinted, the fault, in part at least, was his own. But was the man even remotely right? Plainly, he must have been difficult to please. For hardly had the book appeared in the shops, when praise and blame began to fall like thunderclaps. Such fellows of the intellect as Diderot, Duclos, and d'Alembert poured enchanted hosannas upon it. But the theological dignitaries of the Sorbonne beat their breasts and denounced the book as a plot of Satan. In England the volume was acclaimed with a festive air, and was twice translated—a distinction unachieved by any previous French *opus.* The Archbishop of Paris damned the whole business and commended its author to the stake and the faggot. But when Rousseau fled to Protestant Geneva he found the gates locked, and his book ordered burned in the public square. Put under the ban in most of the civilized continental domains, the book, as usual, attracted readers in droves. And few of these, after having devoured the book, were ever quite the same again. Certainly it's not altogether astounding, when the guns of the Revolution belched out their doom of the old order of things, to witness the commoners of France saluting Rousseau as their savior. Nor is it astounding to behold them laying his bones in a distinguished grave in the Pantheon. Nor is it astounding to see him honored even today in some of the very places he once lashed to fury.

No other pedagogical treatise—not even Plato's *Republic,* I am inclined to believe—has ever had the sweeping and lasting influence of *Emile.* Rousseau's scheme has been labeled a grandiose and idealistic dream-book. Yet for generations sober pedagogues have been striving to approximate in practice the best of Rousseau's ideals. The critics, as usual, stand divided in their opinions of these ideals. Lasserre, for instance, is left quite cold, and dismisses the whole matter as "not worth a shrug of the shoulders." [5] But Lanson knocks it clean over the fence as "the most beautiful, the most thorough, and the most suggestive educational treatise ever written." [6] Between these two dicta, I believe, lies the truth. Recorded on the debit side of *Emile* are plenty of entries, the more glaring ones being that in the main it is negative, individualistic, impractical, and anti-social. On the credit side one finds that Rousseau put a premium on reason. He urged that nothing should be taught a child until he could understand it; that the youngster should learn directly from experience rather than indirectly from books; that physical activity and health are of prime importance; that a child's natural interests, such as curiosity and play, should be capitalized in his education; that education should be less literary and linguistic and more sensory and rational; that the child should be taught rather than the subject-matter; that the stress placed upon memory in education is altogether top-heavy; and finally that education should be many-sided so as to indicate a child's possibilities.

---

[5] Lasserse, *"Le romantisme français,"* p. 68

[6] Lanson, *"Histoire de la litterature francaise,"* p. 796.

Chapter Two

BASEDOW

EARLY YEARS.—In the bullring of schoolmastering Rousseau, as we have noted, had no practical experience. None the less the eminent Genevan served pedagogy not only well but indispensably. Education, as he saw it, appeared unsound and futile, and hence, he believed, its main rules and operations ought to be changed. His conviction that something ought to be done with the pedagogics of his time took shape in the *Emile,* and this, as I have said, flogged the ears of the world. The first pedagogue to react in a significant way was a German by the name of Johann Berend Bassedau—or as he later preferred to label himself, Johann Bernhard Basedow. A Hamburger by birth, Johann arrived in this world in 1723. His early life at home, as in the case of Rousseau, wasn't particularly attractive. Basedow, Sr., a wigmaker by vocation, was a stern and implacable fellow who knew much more about the art of turning out handsome perukes than about the occult secrets of the child psyche. He failed utterly to understand his son. The boy's mother was neurotic, given to fits of insanity, through one of which she eventually came to her end.

Such domestic environs obviously were destined to leave their mark. Like Rousseau, little Johann grew up wild and undisciplined, full of the Devil, and forever entangled in some sort of a scrape. To curb his son's unbridled mischief-making, the elder Basedow took the boy into his shop as an apprentice. But the youngster, still in his tender years, continued in no uncertain way to mix pleasure and business—a practice which, quite naturally, the father resented. Specifically, this paternal resentment took the guise of terrific lashings which, despite the high fervor with which they were applied, were in the main without effect. Finally, as the boy continued to flout him, the exasperated pater began to adorn his whalings with a varied assortment of cuffs, kicks, and high-powered curses. But this the boy decided was more than he could stand, and hence as soon as he got his chance he ran away.

Early Education.—The light-hearted youth made for Holstein. Here he entered the service of a country doctor, who soon found that his young employé had more than average ability. Though only fifteen, Basedow showed that he was of the first calibre, and that he had an excellent mind. The doctor liked the youngster and treated him in a gracious way. So well, indeed, did this country medico comport himself toward the lad, that for once the latter was inordinately happy. Finally, the well-meaning physician even effected a reconciliation between the Basedows, *Vater und Sohn,* and the boy, somewhat reluctantly to be sure, returned to the family commons. He was now put into school and landed eventually in the classical gymnasium. Here, where German brains are weighed and selected, young Basedow easily passed inspection. As a student he was incandescent. In fact, so bright did he flare that even his teachers looked upon him as somewhat of a marvel. Philosophy was his main intellectual fodder. But he had time also, it appears, to tutor, for cash, some of his less gifted colleagues. Incidentally, he also dabbled in beautiful letters, putting down a lyric now and then on such inspiring themes as holidays, birthdays, or other family celebrations. While such poesy didn't enrich the world's great literature to any marked extent, it was, like his tutoring, a steady filler of his exchequer. Through all these varied and serious doings, Basedow, curiously enough, kept his old and potent talent for horseplay—a tendency which usually got him into more trouble than comfort.

University Study.—Meanwhile, through the unfathomable workings of fate, the elder Basedow had taken the idea into his head that his Johann, wild and erratic though he was, had been marked by God for the ministry. Thus in 1744, at the age of twenty-one, armed with a scholarship, the gifted

Basedow appeared at Leipzig. Here for a time he listened sedulously to the great learning of his professors. To the swift-minded and independent Basedow, however, much of the professorial wisdom appeared shabby and preposterous. And so, determining not to let these lectures interfere with his education, he began to stay away from his classes—a practice which, though frowned at by American men of learning, is yet ethical and esteemed at most European universities. Not that Basedow now let himself down in an orgy of loafing and *Biergemütlichkeit.* On the contrary. Talented and highly ambitious as he was, he went instead on a carousal of reading. Philosophy and theology attracted him in particular, and in these honorable disciplines he sucked in every conceivable and available volume. Thus mainly by his own hard efforts he became privy to the secrets of his chosen profession. But when the time arrived for him to be put into holy orders, his reverend superiors, more wise perhaps than they realized, put the ban on the young man's ordination. Basedow's life and beliefs, it appears, had been too low and irregular to suit his theological chiefs. Greatly disappointed, Basedow after only three semesters at Leipzig finally determined to pull up the academic stakes and make for home.

A Private Tutor.—Like so many other frustrated candidates for the cloth Basedow, now turned to teaching, his first post being a private tutorship in the family of a Mr. von Quaalen, a distinguished and wealthy Holsteiner. For four years, up to 1753, Basedow graced his job fulfilling its requirements, in essence, in a facile and satisfactory way. It was while he worked in the von Quaalen domicile that Basedow dived into his first educational experiments. Thus, adapting his methods to the capacities and interests of his learners, he was ever on the watch for new and better ways of putting his teaching across. Like most good teachers, he sizzled with enthusiasm for his work, and though some of the methods he developed had already been commended to pedagogues by the illustrious Locke and Montaigne, yet Basedow did some excellent and original work. Thus, for example, he shoved the formalized textbook into the background, and used real, concrete instructional material as far and often as possible. Geography he taught through a study of the local territory. In the teaching of Latin, interestingly enough, he gave the formal and grammatical methods a determined thrust on the chin. Thus he taught the ancient lingo of the Romans in a direct, conversational way, speaking with his pupils not only during the periods reserved for Latin, but on every possible occasion. The results he achieved were excellent. They demonstrated magnificently and irrefutably that he knew at least how to teach.

Soröe.—After four years with the von Quaalens Basedow took up teaching in a full and professional way, getting employment at a Danish *Ritterakademie,* a fashionable finishing school at place called Soröe. Here at the age of thirty he set himself down to teach morals and polite letters to the sons of the *haut monde.* An indefatigable worker, Basedow trained himself for his job by studying his art until all hours of the morning. On such occasions, when sleep was about to lay him low, he managed to stay awake in the traditional way by flooding his stomach with coffee. After several years of hard and diligent work he bestowed upon the world a confection of his own. Denominating it "a practical philosophy for all classes," he leaned in this study to the view that the purpose of education is to train children for a happy and socially useful adulthood. In the classroom, as might be expected, Basedow was a huge success, and hence he never lacked an attentive and appreciative audience. As often happens, this brought down upon him the dislike of his less gifted colleagues. Banding together, they made Basedow suspect to the authorities. Thus it was hinted, and with some truth I fear, that at bottom Basedow was a low fellow, who speeded his metabolism with alcohol, and whose orthordoxy was outlandish. Much heat was shed by the embattled pedagogues who, indeed, didn't cool off until the heretical Basedow was transferred to another school at Altona.

Altona.—In this celebrated town Basedow went to work in 1761 as an instructor at the *Gymnasium.* Unfortunately the bad repute into which he had fallen at Soröe, rather than his distinguished feats in that place, trailed after him to Altona. And thus Basedow suffered considerably at the hands of his *fratres in facultate.* Even his students, moreover, showered no warmth on his suffering soul. But the vast pressure of this organized distrust didn't altogether disrupt the unfortunate Basedow. With a teaching program of only three hours a week, instead of eight hours a day as at Soröe, Basedow now immersed himself in study and in writing. A series of monographs paraded from his pen. At the outset, curiously enough, this "enemy and abominable seducer of Christianity," devoted considerable effort to moral and religious themes. But in the main these had a rationalistic hue, and hence the theologians became more convinced than ever that Basedow was simply a tool of Satan. Indeed, the theological wrath bulged to such dimension that finally Basedow and his whole family were refused communion and were put under the ecclesiastical ban. Worse than even this, however, as far as Basedow himself was concerned, was the fact that the printing of his writings was strictly forbidden. Teachers using his texts, moreover, were made to mend their wicked ways by being threatened with banishment. Did all this dismay the hard-pressed Basedow? Did he rush for the mourner's bench? Did he commend himself to exorcism? Had he been the hyprocrite that posterity has at times claimed him to be, such, it seems to me, would have been a sane procedure. But Basedow preferred to meet his adversaries in his own rational way. Despite the ban set on his writings, he managed, *pianissimo,* to fling off further tracts and to have them set up in print. More important then this, however, I believe, is the fact that he still retained several moneyed and influential friends, who were willing to finance him. These Mæcenas were soon and often to hear the call of Basedow.

AN ADDRESS TO PHILANTROPISTS.—In the midst of all this theological bickering, Basedow became cognizant of *Emile.* So strongly did this lash his fancy that he made up his mind to leave the religious controversy to his more potent and determined fellows, and devote his further energies to education. He lusted, in brief, to put into practice some of Rousseau's startling ideas. With this in mind he issued in 1768 a tractate which combined educational postulates with an appeal for funds. It bore the lengthy title *"An Address to Philanthropists and Men of Property on Schools and Studies* *and Their Influence on the Public Weal.* [1] Three main ideas adorn the address. For one thing, Basedow wanted the schools to be non-sectarian. For another thing, he argued that the clerical influence should be clipped from public education, and that the latter should be under the guard of a national council of education. Both of these ideas were then in high esteem with the French radicals, particularly with such fellows as Turgot and La Chalotais. Finally, Basedow recommended a number of pedagogical reforms which, in their essence, however, spring back to the writings of such eminent experts as the Messrs. Comenius, Locke, and Rousseau. The most important part of the address, from Basedow's standpoint, no doubt was its appeal for funds to help him bring out new and up-to-date books on elementary education. The appeal, I daresay, must have been ably and convincingly written. For soon a stupendous rush of gold began to flow in Basedow's direction. Protestants, Catholics, and Jews contributed. Not to be outdone, the idealistic Freemasons dispatched their contribution. The poor, as always, did more than their bit. But most interesting of all, I am inclined to feel, was the way Basedow's touch for funds struck the princes of the blood. The great Catherine II of Russia put herself down for one thousand Reichsthaler (a Reichsthaler was about 73 cents), while King Christian VII of Denmark came through with nine hundred. Grand Prince Paul of Russia, Emperor Joseph II, and squads of other ermined potentates added substantial sums to the list, so that in the end Basedow amassed some $10,000.

---

[1] *Vorstellung an Menschenfreunde und vermögende Männer über Schule und Studien und ihren Einfluss in die öffentliche Wohlfahrt.*

THE *Methodenbuch* AND THE *Elementarwerk.*—Six years after his appeal Basedow put out two books. The first, again heavily titled, was his *Book for Fathers and Mothers of Families and Nations.*[2] True to its name, it was a book for adults. In the main it offered familiar stuff, but this was still new enough in education to be in the realm of theory rather than practice. Thus Basedow rang up such well known numbers as "follow nature," "non-sectarian religious instruction," "sense training," "direct method in language teaching," and so on. His other study was a work in four volumes, known as the *Elementarwerk.* Dedicated to his altruistic benefactors—most of whom Basedow took great pains to single out by name—the *Elementarwerk,* was the first illustrated textbook to make its appearance since the famous *Orbis Pictus,* which had come out more than a century before in 1654. Basedow's volume scored a bull's-eye, and for many of the ensuing years it was held in high favor. In brief, the book added nothing new to Basedow's pedagogic repertoire. Like its distant relative, the *Orbis Pictus,* Basedow's *Elementarwerk* was a huge congeries of knowledge. It covered a lavish territory including such fields as morals, etiquette, commerce, natural objects, and so on. In short, it had much the mien of a well stocked modern American university. Characteristically enough, its author thought very highly of his work. He saluted it as "an incomparable method, founded on experience, of teaching children to read without weariness or loss of time."

---

[2] *Methodenbuch für Väter und Mütter der Familien u. Völker*

THE *Philanthropinum.*—For a long while Basedow and his operations had bulged the eyes of the mellow Prince Leopold of Dessau, who now made up his mind to secure this magnificent pedagogue for his own domain. Thus with an offer of an $800 annuity, the Prince got Basedow to let himself down in Dessau, where the educator was to be allowed full freedom to establish a school founded entirely upon the principles he had so often intoned. This was the celebrated *Philanthropinum,* a new-type school of which great things were expected. Here most of Basedow's pet principles were to be solemnized in practice. Education was to be natural. Children were to be treated not as adults, but as children. Powdered hair, rouge, swords and such wordly gauds were promptly put upon the blacklist, since they tended to impede a youngster's natural behavior. The boys, moreover, were to don simple sailor suits. Physical training was given heavy stress. Foreign language, of which French and Latin were on hand, was to be taught in a natural, conversational way. The whole day was routinized. Thus, seven hours were allotted for sleep; five went for study; three were given to dancing, fencing, physical training, and music; six were devoted to meals, play, and manual work; and one hour was concentrated to the important job of putting rooms and belongings in order. The school, as might be expected, was non-sectarian. In it there was to be an "air of religion," but theological hair-splitting was strictly prohibited.

The *Philanthropinum* heaved open its doors in 1774, but since most parents were afraid to let their offspring be the subject of such an unusual experiment, only a handful of students enrolled. In truth, beside Basedow's own two children, there were only twelve others. These were taught by Basedow and three excellent assistants. In 1776, with his usually sharp eye for publicity, Basedow broadcast invitations to the world in general, and the high and potent dignitaries in particular, to be present at a general public examination of his students. "The results," he wrote, "that can already be perceived, show that what we promise is true." Furthermore, it might be a good idea, he thought, for the various governments to dispatch some of their experts to the examination where "so much of importance will be seen, heard, investigated, and discussed." The examination solemnities in the main were quite successful. Basedow's own daughter, Emilie, somewhat of a prodigy, attracted particular attention. The learned Immanuel Kant indorsed the school in a couple of newspaper articles, and bawled for financial help for its founder. The much more critical Herder, however, in a letter to one of his friends damned the whole business. "To me," he confided, "it all seems horrible, like a hothouse or a table filled with human geese. To Basedow, whom I know personally, I wouldn't give even calves to be educated—to say nothing of human beings."

Such corrosive puffs of criticism as that of Herder were of course in the minority. At bottom, though, the old fellow was full of sound sense. Thus, even before the year had passed, signs of the inevitable end were already stalking through the halls of Basedow's academy. The first blow to fall landed on the head of Basedow and removed him as *chargé d'affaires* of the *Philanthropinum.*

Soon thereafter he quit altogether and left for other parts. For a time he continued his teaching, though in a modest and private way. His main work, however, had already been done. Finally in 1790 a hemorrhage laid him low. His exitus was thoughtful as well as characteristic. "I wish," he whispered, "my body to be dissected for the good of my fellow-men." But even here, ironically enough, Basedow's hopes were never fulfilled.

Three years after Basedow's final departure, the school which he had launched as a dazzling lodestar came to an end, a dismal and depressing smudge. If the *Philanthropinum* ended so ignominiously, the fault, I believe, was largely that of Basedow. Gifted beyond doubt as a teacher, the man, however, lacked every conceivable executive quality. Vain, bibulous, quarrelsome, tactless, a man whom his fellows openly called mad, Basedow had never quite effaced the scars of his childhood. His ideas on the whole were quite sound. Yet sane as they were, the immodest words in which he draped them often grated the sensibilities of intelligent men. Moreover, his berserker dislike of the theological brethern, sincere and honest though it was, served him to no good end.

BASEDOW'S PEDAGOGY.—In his pedagogy Basedow, as I have noted, borrowed heavily from Rousseau and Comenius, but particularly from the former. He taught, like the immortal Socrates, through conversation. Anticipating Froebel, Basedow taught by play—and here obviously he was far ahead of his era. His teaching, as we have seen, was founded on an appeal to the senses. To put this across with success he used the surrounding objects. Like Comenius, he wrote an illustrated textbook, and again like Comenius, he put into it an encyclopedic program that stretched from a study of the mind, to religion, to the social duties, to actual business. His *Philanthropinum* was the first school that had the *Emile* for its source. Advocating universal education, he flung open the doors of his academy to the poor as well as the rich; but the education he offered the two social strata was different. The rich he trained for social leadership; the poor were to be converted into contented workers. The descendants of the moneyed burghers studied six hours a day and did manual work for two hours. The offspring of the poor reversed the program. His methods were about as up-to-date as he could make them. Arithmetic he made mental; geography was taught from the home ground outward; grammer was studied for the sake of literature; and religion, of course, was non-sectarian. The aim of it all, as Basedow looked at it, was to turn out citizens of the world.

Basedow's Influence.—Basedow's *Philanthropinum* may have gone down and out, but its influence was much more than merely transient. Christian Salzmann (1744-1811), once a teacher in the original *Philanthropinum,* established a similar academy at a place called Schnepfenthal in Saxe-Gotha. The school opened for business in 1784 and catered to the wealthy. Like Basedow's school, that of Salzmann was secular. Though the pupils were the offspring of the courtly and well heeled, yet Salzmann put his protégés through a stiff and potent discipline. Thus the youngsters arose at cockcrow. Their setting-up drill took the form of a few hours of gardening or farming or animal-tending. After which the youngsters progressed to chapel and lifted themselves with a few lusty morning songs. By this time no doubt their youthful stomachs had begun to rumble, and so breakfast was served. Eight hours a day were contributed to study; several went for play and recreation; and at least one was credited to gymnastics. Like the *Philanthropinum,* which sired it, the Schnepfenthal school was run on model pedagogic lines. Salzmann was a first-rate educator, and among the ranking pedagogues he is almost unique for his sane, practical judgment. His school was caressed by prosperity, and after the death of its founder, continued to be run along sound lines. In 1884 it celebrated its one-hundredth anniversary. Beside Basedow and Salzmann there were hordes of other philanthropinists. Wolke, Behrdt, Campe, and Trapp were probably the main celebrities in this particular field of educational endeavor. Most of these fellows did good work and cleared the field for the development of secular and public education.

Chapter Three

PESTALOZZI

EARLY LIFE.—Pestalozzi, if the historians have it right, is an Italian name. Somewhere toward the middle of the sixteenth century it was brought to Switzerland when a band of frightened Protestants fled from the all too eager zeal of the papal devotees on the other side of the Alps. Some two centuries later—January 12, 1746—there was born into the Pestalozzi tribe, now domiciled happily at Zurich, a little boy to whom were given the sturdy bourgeois names of Johann Heinrich. During the first five years of little Johann's earthly career nothing very startling or important happened. But as the boy swung into the sixth lap of life he lost his father, a hard-working, but not over-prosperous eye-doctor. With the doctor's passing, the cares involved in raising little Johann Heinrich and two other children—beside swarms of other cares—were left to Mrs. Pestalozzi. Good-hearted and devoted to her family, the doctor's widow tackled the formidable job of squeezing a living out of a very meager income. It was, no doubt, in these early years, and in an environment soaked with self-denial, that young Pestalozzi made his first acquaintance with ideals. It was at this time, too, that the boy, was spoiled. For being somewhat frail of frame and sensitive of mood, he became the very natural target for the uncountable jokes and schemes of his youthful and more vigorous playmates. At such times, instead of standing up and fighting back, Johann would not unfrequently take to his heels, and he would see to it, moreover, that these would direct him as fast as possible to safety behind his mother's sheltering apron. Being less wise than motherly, the good Mrs. Pestalozzi tended in such moments to be somewhat lavish in her sympathy. A strong paternal hand, many experts contend, would have changed all this. But no doubt it would also have changed the Pestalozzi who subsequently emerged into adulthood—a kind-hearted, sympathetic dreamer, who, so the monument over his grave records, did "everything for others, but nothing for himself."

This shy and impractical figure, curiously enough, was destined for a vast and herioc part in modern pedagogy. Yet—even more curious, perhaps—this fellow, though at least normally intelligent, was never much of a student. Up to his very end he was an ignoramus in spelling and had his troubles with grammer. Arithmetic knocked him cold, and his handwriting was deemed an amusing curiosity. Despite these strange shortcomings, however, young Pestalozzi eventually landed in the celebrated *Collegium Humanitatis,* an academy which, true to its ancient name, specialized in the classics. With two years of humanistic wisdom safely plucked, Pestalozzi studied for another brace of years at the *Collegium Carolinum* whose main operations were in the theological domain.

His Early Education and Ideals.—If Pestalozzi never became privy to the simple academic fundamentals known to every third-rate bookkeeper, he was at least able to profit handsomely from the high and infectious personality of his pedagogues. Some of these, particularly Bodmer and Breitinger, were intellectual whales as well as gifted teachers. Breitinger taught Greek and Hebrew, and knew how to make his pupils like these ancient disciplines. Bodmer specialized in history and politics. Like Socrates, he preferred to converse with his pupils rather than bombard them with intellectual harangues. Both men were strangely influential in the idealism they preached—so much so, indeed, that for a time young Pestalozzi turned vegetarian and slept without clothes or covers on the hard floor of his room. The air was heavy with ideals—ideals dealing particularly with political, moral, and intellectual freedom, While Pestalozzi bathed in this grandiose atmosphere, his interest in the uplift was stimulated to an even greater degree by his grandfather, a village gentleman of the cloth, whose ministry brought him in close touch with human misery. Accompanying his grandfather on his ministerial rounds, the boy, overwhelmed by what he saw, decided then and there to pull the down-trodden out of their misery. "Ever since my boyhood," he later confided, "my heart has yearned to stop at its source, the wretchedness into which I saw the people had sunk." Like his grandfather, Pestalozzi decided to become a man of God. Unfortunately, however, the road to the uplift was studded with bumps. Thus, while firing off a trial sermon, Pestalozzi reverted to his early shyness, a trait which, as every one knows, is not ordinarily conductive to good oratory. The youth became undeniably flustered; his words jammed; and soon the flow of his message stopped altogether. With this dismal breakdown went Pestalozzi's hopes for a pastor's career.

LAW.—But he was by no means through with the uplift. If he had failed miserably one way, certainly there were plenty of other ways to snare success. And so he turned to the study of law. But here, too, alas, obstacles loomed on the highroad. Those were the days when the determined and democratic burghers of Geneva were fighting it out with a gang of despotic rulers. From the side-lines the citizens of Zurich watched the bout with considerable interest. Some of them—quite *pianissimo,* it is true—even sided with the people of Geneva. A few careless souls, among them the celebrated Bodmer, dared, however, to roar their high hopes in public, and in their zeal proceeded to dig a grave for constituted authority. To make matters even more interesting, it was just at this time that Rousseau fashioned his red-hot pokers in the form of *Emile* and the *Social Contract.* Naturally, Pestalozzi wasn't slow to see in all this unrest an open door to the realization of the ideals he had so long cherished. Thus in 1765, with a number of fellow-students, he joined the patriotic Helvetic Society, and proceeded to warm the air with his diatribes against tyranny. At the same time he began to fling off contributions for the *Erinnerer,* a weekly journal consecrated to social, moral, and educational discussions. Though most of the stuff in the *Erinnerer* proved to be harmless blather, now and then a reckless writer would take a shot or two at the Zurich government. Naturally enough, the town's reigning Justinians grew uneasy under such disrespectful treatment, and they promptly issued warnings to the enemy to cease firing. When, however, the journal refused to haul up the white flag, and proceeded, instead, to lampoon some of the city's magistrates, the authorities emphatically pulled the brakes. Not only was the offending *Erinnerer* heaved into the public bonfire, but some of its knavish contributors drew a caustic dressing down from the city hall. Pestalozzi, though later proved innocent, was seized and hurled into the dungeon. With all this dubious publicity falling like hailstones, and with the indignant city fathers steadfastly on the prowl for his scalp, Pestalozzi obviously could see no easy road to his intended legal goal. Hence, here again his professional ambitions started along the *via dolorosa* of his other frustrated hopes.

NEUHOF.—Even so, however, Pestalozzi was still heavily inoculated with ideals. With a public career plainly impossible, he bought himself a small farm which he baptized Neuhof, and on which he hoped to teach his peasant neighbors the value of up-to-date and improved methods in agriculture. This was in 1769, the date which also marked the beginning of Pestalozzi's married life with Anna Schulthess, the daughter of prosperous merchant. As an experiment in altruism, however, Neuhof was doomed at the outset. Impractical and unbusinesslike, Pestalozzi attracted frauds and mountebanks in flocks, and after five years of incessant sweat and struggle, the Zurich idealist watched his farming venture go down the chute.

THE EMILE INFLUENCE.—Meanwhile the Pestalozzi family had added to its membership an infant son, who, in honor of Jean Jacques Rousseau, was named Jacob, the German version of Rousseau's middle name. The arrival of this baby did much to put Pestalozzi, Sr., into the ranks of the pedagogues. For as the child began to develop, his father determined to put to work as far as possible the principles set down in the celebrated *Emile.* Thus he carefully observed and taught his youngster, and stowed copious notes of these doings into a diary which many years later was put into print. [1] As Pestalozzi's initial plunge into the mysteries of the educative process, the diary merits at least an historic interest. In the main, however, it is simply another variation of the familiar Rousseau *leitmotif*—with the important difference, perhaps, that Pestalozzi, not content with beauteous babblings, was building his conclusions on actual doings. Childish though he often was in mundane affairs, Pestalozzi apparently was sane enough in his activities as a pedagogue to sense that vast slices of Rousseau were impossible. "Let us," he said, "make use of what is wise in his principles," and this, plainly enough, was a good deal.

Pestalozzi's next step to pedagogic eminence came with the final flop of his Neuhof experimental station. Curiously enough, the man still lusted to improve the world, and straightway he took another header into altruism, putting into effect this time a hope which had first bulged his breast almost a decade before. Thus toward the end of 1774 he transformed part of his home into a school and put into it some twenty down-and-out peasant boys and girls. [2] Through education and environment these youngsters were to be made privy to decency and self-respect. To catch this high goal, the children were at the outset to be made literate. Morals and character were to be given special treatment. In addition, these peasant lads and lassies were to be given a very practical training in spinning, weaving, housekeeping, gardening, farming, dairying, and such well known arts and sciences. For a time everything went well and with inordinate smoothness. True, there wasn't much gold in the Pestalozzian treasury, but this was a familiar situation, and hence it didn't dampen the idealist's high zeal. Moreover, by broadcasting appeals for funds Pestalozzi was actually able to gather some financial assistance. This help, together with his own incurable optimism, led him to increase the number of his youthful protégés to half-a-hundred. Two hard years of his life the determined Pestalozzi thus sweated away, living, as he later said "in the midst of fifty little beggars, sharing in my poverty my bread with them, living like a beggar myself in order to teach beggars to live like men." When those two years were about up, however, failure was once more stalking before the gates of Neuhof. Impractical as he was, Pestalozzi had fallen headlong into debt. As usual, his creditors were determined fellows. That they refused to be put off indefinitely and finally put an end to the experiment can hardly be held against them.

---

[1] *Wie Vater Pestalozzi anno 1774 sein drei und einhalbjähriges Söhnlein Jacobli unterrichtet,"* first published by Niederer in 1828.

---

[2] It was the practice among many farmers of the day to take orphan apprentices on their farms, and by systematically overworking and underfeeding them to haul in a handsome profit from the children's labor. These neglected youngsters obviously had little chance to grow up into decent men and women. When, in 1765, Pestalozzi joined the Helvetic Society, some study was given this maleficent situation. Among the many relief plans considered was one which suggested the establishment of industrial rural schools. Unfortunately most of the plans discussed remained in the realm of metaphysics.

HIS EARLY WRITINGS.—With the fall of the Neuhof undertaking, Pestalozzi shelved his philanthropy for a while and turned to writing for a livelihood. In 1780 he completed his *Evening Hours of a Hermit,* a collection of aphorisms containing the germ of his pedagogical credo. Yet despite this significance they failed to draw much attention from the public. A year after the appearance of the *Evening Hours* Pestalozzi turned to lighter stuff, and this time better luck caressed his efforts. This was when he put out his celebrated *Leonard and Gertrude.* Attempting to limn the influence of a good woman in lifting a debased community from its corruption, *Leonard and Gertrude,* is mainly a rhapsody of sentiment. It contains, however, some first-rate suggestions for political, social and educational reforms. As a story, the book made a palpable hit with its romantic consumers, most of whom, however, weren't the least interested in the author's social visions.

THE INFLUENCE OF LEONARD AND GERTRUDE.—If Pestalozzi's cries for the uplift failed to stir the general public, his ideas on the subject didn't escape some of the world's keener intellects. Indeed, as a result of *Leonard and Gertrude* Pestalozzi was drawn into contact with a swarm of eminent and potent personalities. His correspondence grew like a tapeworm. Some important members of the political gentry became interested in his ideas, and high dignitaries of state from Austria, Germany, and Italy even sought his counsel on social perplexities. Some of these illustrious gentlemen paraded all the way to Neuhof to meet the eminent Pestalozzi in person. With so many hosannas pouring into his sanctum Pestalozzi decided to repeat his literary success by turning out several sequels to *Leonard and Gertrude.* None of these, however, made the grade, and hence no staggering honoraria flowed into the Pestalozzian wallet. Instead of cash, however, the gifted Swiss reaped honors. These arrived in flocks, and ranged from the handclasp and approval of the mighty Fichte to an honorary citizenship of France. Yet despite all these shining and glamorous gauds, at fifty Pestalozzi was essentially a failure, disappointed and forlorn, and vanquished in nearly every major undertaking.

STANZ.—Notwithstanding the many hard wallops handed him by fate Pestalozzi continued to hold his head high and to work for the realization of his ideals. In 1798 his career underwent a significant change. Those were the days, it will be recalled, when the French were working hard to spread the blessings of their Revolution to other lands. Switzerland, ever a haven for political theories, responded by remodeling its government along the latest French lines, which at the time happened to be the *directoire exécutif*. To this new government Pestalozzi gave his support, for in it he saw the medium which would effect at least some of the reforms for which he had been bawling so long. The reigning Swiss directors, appreciating Pestalozzi's compliment, bathed the idealist with their broadest smiles and proceeded to offer him their political patronage. But as usual Pestalozzi's wants were quite modest. All that he craved was a job as schoolmaster. But even such simple positions in those hard times weren't abundant, and thus the fulfilment of Pestalozzi's wish encountered some delay. Meanwhile, however, destiny, assisted by the French army, took a hand. Not all Swiss, it appeared, were in favor of the new government. Some of the conservative Catholic cantons in particular were against it. In the Nidwald canton this opposition, stimulated by the Capucin monks, made such roaring headway that Paris caught notice of it. The French, having in a way sponsored the new Swiss regime, made up their mind that it was time to teach these stubborn conservatives a much-needed lesson. And so French soldiery was dispatched to the recalcitrant cantons. These Gallic musketeers were efficient and thorough. The little town of Stanz, for example, they reduced to ashes. Before they finally marched away, moreover, they slaughtered most of the available inhabitants, and left in their wake a long line of destitute orphans. These forlorn children the Swiss government now offered to the care of Pestalozzi, and though the job loomed much vaster than even he had ever dared to dream, he hurried to Stanz, as he said, "gladly," hoping "to offer these innocent little ones some compensation for the loss they had sustained."

Only an idealist of the first order could have spoken thus. For as I have said, the task of caring for these hordes of orphans was enormous. Not only did the town's adult survivors hold Pestalozzi suspect as a heretic and as an instrument of a detested government, but the children themselves constituted a weighty problem. For months before Pestalozzi arrived on the scene, most of these youngsters had been living as homeless beggars. Health, habits, and morals had gone down the slide so far that any effort to revive them seemed doomed at the outset. Beside all these staggering difficulties Pestalozzi was handicapped all along the line by a shortage of materials. The government, it is true, had put at his disposal a retired convent wherein he housed his orphans. But for the actual work of instruction there were neither books nor equipment nor assistants. As a result of all these and other obstacles, however, Pestalozzi concentrated on oral instruction. Nature study and geography were approached through conversation while in number and language work objects were used and discussed. Plainly, Pestalozzi put a premium on the child's ability to learn from what he observed.

> I believe that the first development of thought in the child is very much disturbed by a wordy system of teaching, which is not adapted either to his faculties or the circumstances of his life. According to my experience, success depends upon whether what is taught to children commends itself to them as true

> through being closely connected with their own observation. ([8])

Curiously enough, the stamp of Pestalozzi's Neuhof experiment was still discernible, for when the Zurich educator began his work at Stanz he started with the idea of establishing an industrial school where the main stress was to be on the manual arts. "I started," he says, "with the idea of connecting their learning with their manual work." At Stanz, however, Pestalozzi's outlook appears to have grown much broader. Thus the children were to produce things not for the sake of revenue, but rather to snare physical dexterity and bodily efficiency. The process was to have educational rather than economic value. "I am more than ever convinced," said Pestalozzi, "that as soon as we have educational establishments combined with work-shops, and conducted on a truly psychological basis, a generation will necessarily be formed which will show us by experience that our present studies do not require one-tenth of the time or trouble we now give to them." But due to Pestalozzi's lack of equipment at Stanz none of these high goals could be clutched.

His greatest task of all, perhaps, was to win the good will of his pupils. And here he was far in advance of the common practices of his era.

---

[8] *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children.* I.

Instead of setting himself up as a drill-master with text-book and rattan close at hand, Pestalozzi sought results by showering sincere and honest affection upon his little protégés. "He tried," says one of his biographers, "to make them feel like brothers and sisters, each one of whom had an interest in and duties towards the others." [4] Such kindly treatment was bound in the end, of course, to yield good fruit. The children blossomed remarkably and steadily. After six months, however, the French, retreating from a trouncing at the hands of the Austrians, once more made their appearance at Stanz. This time they demanded and got the convent for military purposes. Thus, in their own peculiar way these French soldiers managed to land in the pages of educational history. For not only did they serve to launch the experiment at Stanz, but they also brought it to a close. For Pestalozzi, however, this sudden end was fortunate. His mind had been too much on his work and not enough on himself. His health gave out, and he was removed for recovery to an Alpine resort. Behind his back, as usual, critical tongues began to wag. All they saw in Pestalozzi's operations at Stanz was another failure. What they didn't see, however, was that in this town

---

[4] Green, J. A., *Life and Work of Pestalozzi*, p. 87

Pestalozzi had actually laid the cornerstone of the modern elementary school.

Burgdorf.—When Pestalozzi was once more on his feet he answered his shrewd critics by silently going back to the job of schoolmastering. This time he went to work at Burgdorf. Here in 1799 he started out in a village school as assistant to a man named Dysli, a fellow who in his more ambitious moments was engaged as the town's chief shoemaker. Plainly, Pestalozzi and his chief were not an ideal pedagogical partnership. In the art of making wearable and comfortable shoes Mr. Dysli may have been a marvel, but in the field of pedagogy he was, alas, not so brilliant. Pestalozzi, on the other hand, was a downright ignoramus as a cobbler, but always loaded with new and lively ideas in education. Some of these thoughts in those days smacked of pedagogic bolshevism, and so it isn't altogether surprising to see Pestalozzi finally ousted from his job because of his methods. Pestalozzi's friends, however, were on hand to deaden the jolt by securing for him the use of part of an ancient Burgdorf castle together with its garden. Here Pestalozzi set up his school. In time he gathered quite a number of pupils. To teach these he hired a half-dozen excellent teachers, who naturally enough applied their chief's pedagogical methods. As the work gathered force Pestalozzi established a training school for teachers. The government now dug in its pockets and pulled out a subsidy for the deserving Pestalozzi. In additions some gold poured in from benevolent private citizens. To the development and perfection of his pedagogical ideas Pestalozzi now applied himself more than ever, concentrating especially on the use of objects in instruction. "I want," he said, "to psychologize education." But here he spoke a different language from the modern psychologists. What he meant by his learned phrase, for one thing, was the simplification of knowledge and the grading of it in understandable exercises. All instruction, moreover, was to harmonize with the "laws of intellectual development." All of which in those days of man's scanty acquaintance with the inscrutable antics of the human psyche was obviously a large dose. While all this work was going on Pestalozzi, curiously enough, still had time to put some of his thoughts into print. Notable among his *opera* at this time are his *Mother's Book* and *How Gertrude Teaches Her Children.* The latter is presented to the public in the form of a series of letters written to his friend Gessner, a bookseller in Berne. At bottom it is a first-rate statement of the Pestalozzian pedagogic credo.

At Burgdorf the tasks confronting Pestalozzi and his pedagogues, as I have hinted, were huge.

Yet despite the hordes of difficulites besetting him at every turn, Pestalozzi for once appeared to be knocking them clean over the fence. Indeed, it was at Burgdorf that the eminent Swiss educator began to approach his heyday. Not only his fellow-citizens were beginning to take him and his ideas with a show of deserving respect, but great and well-known pedagogues from other lands had started to trek to his lair to catch glimpses of his method actually at work. In 1804, however, the Swiss government, having changed its political robes, decided that it needed the Burgdorf castle for other purposes. Thus after five years of rising success the Burgdorf academy shut its doors.

YVERDON.—The government graciously enough, however, offered Pestalozzi another location for his work, this time a convent in a town with the outlandish name of Münchenbuchsee. Here, however, Pestalozzi garnered no new laurels. He tried for a time to co-operate with the gifted Emmanuel von Fellenberg, one of his disciples, and active head of an up-and-coming industrial school at Hofwyl. But the two gentlemen simply couldn't work together. Finally Pestalozzi set out for Yverdon, where in 1805 he established his immortal Institute. For just a score of years this school was to carry on the Burgdorf experiment on a grander style than ever. Yverdon in time evolved into a pedagogic Mecca. Teachers and laymen from all over the globe flocked to it. Here Pestalozzi elaborated his entire system, aiming especially to simplify methods in all the elementary subjects. Numerous textbooks based on the Pestalozzian ritual were flung into print. Translated into most of the civilized tongues, these were then broadcast over the world. At Yverdon teacher-training became a special feature. Some of the more alert nations, desiring to have teachers capable of instructing along Pestalozzian lines, granted governmental scholarships to their nascent pedagogues and sent them to Yverdon for training. At Yverdon, moreover, Pestalozzi reached the heights, especially during the first five years of activity. After that bickerings and petty squabbles set in, and fame's gala incandescence gradually began to dim. In 1825 the curtain came down on the final act of Pestalozzi's professional doings. He now retired to the old homestead at Neuhof where two years later he passed away.

THE PESTALOZZIAN CONTRIBUTION.—Thus the man and his work. What now are his main contributions and what their significance? Like the gifted Rousseau, Pestalozzi booted overboard the religious motive in education, a motive which had dominated the elementary school up to the end of the eighteenth century. Education, as Pestalozzi saw it, was "the natural, progressive, and harmonious development" of all the child's "powers and faculties." Education, moreover, was the monopoly of no particular class, but the right of every child. Not only was education to improve the individual, but in the end it was to lead to a reformed society. Again like Rousseau, Pestalozzi demanded that education should cease to be a formalized show, wherein the "empty chattering of mere words" constituted the main doings. "When I look back," he once mused, "and ask myself: What have I specially done for the very being of education, I find I have fixed the highest supreme principles of instruction in the recognition of sense perception as the absolute foundation of all knowledge." [5] This emphasis on sense impression drips from most of Pestalozzi's works. But unlike the seventeenth-century Comenius, Pestalozzi saw in sense perception not simply the highroad to a vast knowledge of objects, but also a way to train the powers of the mind. But his conviction that the senses are the reservoir of *all* our knowledge blinded him to the fact that the reason, for those who have and exercise it, can also be a source of human knowledge.

Observation, as I have said, became the base of all Pestalozzian instruction. To snare and fortify this observation, object lessons and oral teaching were introduced as the *sine qua non* of every well-run Pestalozzian schoolroom. With Pestalozzi, however, the object lesson was an informal procedure. Thus it tended in the main to be alive and breathing with both lungs. So that instruction wouldn't be beyond the pupil's depth, moreover, only objects within his ken were lugged to the classroom and used for his instruction. In all this Pestalozzi plainly was far saner than hordes of his imitators who, being perhaps more practical and systematic than their inspirer, converted the object lesson into a routinized mumbo-jumbo, and hence ruined it.

---

[5] *How Gertrude teaches her children,* x.

Pestalozzi lusted, as he said in a very ominous lingo, to "psychologize education." By this he had in mind merely that learning should proceed somewhat logically "from the simple to the complex, from the known to the unknown." Stated baldly, this dictum is of course thoroughly sound, and ought, I believe, to be applied along the whole curricular line, from courses in contract bridge to stenography to astral physics. Not being familiar, however, with the occult workings of the child mind, Pestalozzi tended at times to misunderstand the nature of the simple and the complex. He failed to realize that what was simple to his adult intellect might be complex to that of the child, and the reverse. Thus in striving to simplify matters he often complicated them. To teach reading, for example, he devised his fantastic "syllabaries," a series of arbitrary letter combinations such as ab, eb, ib, ob, etc. These combinations, and pyramids of others, were rammed into the child's memory, before he was allowed to tackle words and sentences.

Though he bawled for observation and subject material in teaching, Pestalozzi, strangely enough, refused to let his young disciples do their drawing from actual models. True to the Pestalozzian credo, drawing was first analyzed into its elements, and thus the novice was set to work mastering the dull details of curves, angles, and lines. The territory of penmanship at the outset became a subdivision of drawing. Here letters were split into their component parts, such as curved, slanted, and straight lines. All these the rising calligraphist had to subdue before he was allowed to shed his skill on actual letters, not to say words and sentences. Despite such obvious absurdities, however, Pestalozzi insisted on developing his methods by actual practice and experimentation. This with him was new, and it explains in a way his final climb to success. For with Pestalozzi teaching amounted to a sort of passion. From the pedagogic process he drew thrills much like a dermatologist from the sight of a wart. As a result pedagogy for Pestalozzi became as lively as a football game. Theories in education were of course abundant then as well as now; but of such theories Pestalozzi caressed only those that appeared to be sound in practice.

Though many of Pestalozzi's ideas have now been dumped into the boneyard, in one respect, I daresay, his teachings will never turn obsolete. I refer to the spirit which hung over his classroom. Schools in those days, as is well known, were "kept," usually in some private abode, by a person whose professional interests, like those of the cobbler Dysli at Burgdorf, lurked in fields other than teaching. Were such masters capable? Were they sincere? Were they bubbling with eager zeal to teach the young? The answers are obvious. In the main such pedagogues were a pack of dismal charlatans, possessing neither charm nor intellect, and no more deserving of respect than a member of the Vice Trust. That such pedagogues provided themselves with a stout rattan and frequently wielded it is perfectly natural. For them no doubt it was the most effective way of getting results. But when Pestalozzi put on the pedagogical gown, he worked in a different way. To teach effectively, he bathed his young audience with an understanding sympathy. His school, as some critics have announced, was not a school at all, but a family. And if one remembers the boyhood days of Pestalozzi in the mellow, happy company of his mother and brethern, then in truth the critics are right. "Let the child be an individual," he demanded. Let it be a human being. And above all, let the teacher be its trusted friend. So warmly did Pestalozzi glow for these ideals, that he ate, drank, and dreamed them. Once he swung into action, like all first-rate teachers, he was willing to go to any trouble to make his pupils understand and follow. The difficulties that beset his way could no more stop him then a June bug halt a locomotive.

FELLENBERG.—Though highly impractical, especially in such matters as organization and administration, Pestalozzi was fortunate in his associates and friends. Through their writings and operations, his influence crept over two continents. The illustrious von Fellenberg (1771-1884) I have already singled out. While still a young fellow, Fellenberg read *Leonard and Gertrude.* "The book," he averred, "made a deep impression on me, and every time I read it, I was more and more convinced of its truth." Later on he vowed to his mother that he would devote his life to the poor and forsaken children. And being a man of wealth, he was able to put his promise into actual being. Specifically, it took the form of his celebrated Institute at Hofwyl. Here Fellenberg set himself down to apply Pestalozzian idealism. Children of the poor were to get an industrial education plus the elements of an intellectual training. Rich and poor were to be educated together so as to bring about, if possible, a mutual understanding. Teachers were to be trained for service especially in the rural schools. By 1829 the Institute bulged with prosperity. Composed of some six hundred acres, it was graced by workshops for the manufacture of tools and clothing; an agricultural school for the education of farm labor as well as teachers of the rural schools; and a lower school for the teaching of handicrafts. Besides, there were many other features. Girls, of course, were taught at the Institute as well as boys. Fellenberg's work attracted considerable notice. As with Pestalozzi in his prime, educators from all over the globe, hied their way to Hofwyl to observe the Fellenberg experiment. Tons of learned reports were printed in the Old World as well as the New extolling Fellenberg's combination of the intellectual and manual-labor type of education. His plan was widely imitated not only in Europe but in the United States as well.

PESTALLOZZI'S INFLUENCE. — As Pestalozzi plucked more and more fame his methods began to be applied on a larger and larger scale. Oddly enough, Pestalozzi's homeland was rather tardy to profit by this educator's experiments. The main obstacles here were religious and political, and it was not until after the rise of a more liberal government after the Revolution of 1830 that Pestalozzian methods began to make headway in the Swiss schools. Pestalozzi's chief influence on Swiss education, as I have said, was through his follower, Fellenberg.

In some of the outlands, however, Pestalozzian pedagogy became all the rage. Particularly was this the case in Prussia. Both Herbart and Froebel trailed to Yverdon, and the latter even taught there for two years, from 1808 to 1810. The great Fichte, who in those days was striving to awaken the Germans to their pre-Napoleonic consciousness, perceived in Pestalozzian education at least one definite way of effecting the social and political regeneration of Germany, which, as is well known, was then in a bad way. In 1808 the Prussian government itself became aware of Pestalozzi and his high doings. Thus at its own expense it dispatched to the Swiss educator seventeen teachers who for three years were to study Pestalozzi's principles and methods. In the same year the King of Württemberg invited Zeller, an eager Pestalozzian devotee, to become school inspector in his domain. Before a month had elapsed, however, the Prussians lured Zeller to their land with the request that he organize a normal school for the purpose of training rising teachers in the Pestalozzian lore. From then on the work went forward with zest, and, as usual, from Prussia it spread to the other German states.

In our own Republic, too, Pestalozzian pedagogy for a time was received with considerable warmth. Those, however, were the days before education had been hitched to the pragmatic platform of Service and Efficiency. The Pestalozzian movement first arrived in this land from England and was brought over by one of Pestalozzi's erstwhile assistants. He, however, lugged with him the English brand of Pestalozzianism, which had sunk to a hollow and preposterous mechanization. Fortunately, for the good of education, this fellow remained but a short time, and hence exerted little influence. A more important source of Pestalozzianism in this country came in the form of reports and other documents dealing with the operations and ideas of the great Swiss. In 1843 Horace Mann made available a translation of the significant report of Cousin, an illustrious Frenchman, who a dozen years before had been dispatched by his government to study the status of German education. He came back soaked with enthusiasm. One of the things that drew his heavy eulogies in particular was the Pestalozzian methodology. All this Mann made available to his fellow-citizenry, and since he added many comments of his own which weren't exactly complimentary to American education, his translation caused quite a stir. Mann's work in this territory was reinforced by that of Barnard. Through his writings and also through his doings as U. S. Commissioner of Education, Barnard did much to spread Pestalozzianism throughout this land. At first, however, this was restricted to New England. Here a number of the lower schools brought in Pestalozzian methods. In addition some normal schools operated along these lines. What finally put the business over the top, however, was the launching in 1860 of the celebrated Oswego movement through the efforts of Edward Sheldon, then potent as school superintendent at Oswego, N. Y. Nipped by the Pestalozzi germ, Sheldon set himself the task of introducing the Pestalozzian scheme into his schools. With this in mind, he imported from England the necessary equipment and books. A training class for teachers was established, and to run it a master was invited to come from the Mayo school, then a thriving haven of Pestalozzian pedagogy in England. All this happened at a time when the American normal schools were on the rise, and since the Oswego academy was one of the most florescent of such institutions, it was but natural that its Pestalozzian complex should be contagious. At Oswego the object lesson got the main stress, and though there were plenty of critics ready to cashier it, it received the official approval of the National Education Association in 1865, and from then on for a generation it was one of the most puissant forces in the development of American schools.

Chapter Four

HERBART

EARLY LIFE.—Born in Oldenburg in the memorable year of 1776, Johann Friedrich Herbart, unlike his pedagogic predecessors, Rousseau and Pestalozzi, sprang from a high and distinguished family, known particularly for its intellectual accomplishments. The boy had, for example, a maternal grandfather who rose to the heights as the rector of a classical gymnasium. But a worthy competitor of the old gentleman in this field of the intellect was Herbart's own father. He lifted himself in the law, and ultimately garnered a lucrative and distinguished post as an Oldenburg privy councilor. The boy's mother, too, shed plenty of intellectual incandescence. Indeed, in the pages of educational history she has been set down as a "rare and wonderful woman," who was privy to mathematics and Greek, and who, moreover played a strong and capable hand in the education of her Johann Friedrich. Launched in the traditional way of the élite, this education was begun by a tutor and continued subsequently in the classical secondary school. This young Herbart entered at the age of fourteen. Even in those tender years he appears to have stood out as youngster of more than ordinary promise. His memory, for example, was stupendous. Not only did he shine when it came to remembering such grotesqueries as historical dates and geographical boundaries, but he could fling down whole sermons almost *verbatim* after having heard them only once. But the boy had talents in other directions. Thus, in his fourteenth year he confected a treatise bearing the learned and significant title "Concerning the Doctrine of Human Freedom." At school, as might be expected, Herbart threw off more sparks. Physics and philosophy were his favorite subjects. But he was also on friendly terms with the classics. So cordial, in truth, was this understanding, that when the youthful Herbart was selected to serve as class valedictorian, he performed the oratorical rites in Latin, and chose for his subject nothing lighter than a discourse on the thoughts of such whales as Cicero and Kant. Plainly, the boy was no moron.

JENA.—In 1794, reluctantly obeying his father and privy councilor, Johann Friedrich undertook to study law. For these operations he chose the University of Jena. Curiously enough, it was in 1794 that Fichte ascended the professorial chair of philosophy at Jena. It was perfectly natural, I suppose, that the *Studiosus* Herbart, with his deep interest in philosophy, should gravitate to the lectures of Professor Fichte. And since Fichte was bubbling over with good news in his particular subject, it was inevitable that young Herbart should have been impressed. But did he swallow the wisdom of his master? Did he burn to become a second Fichte? Nay. "Fichte," he later admitted, "taught me mainly through his errors." With such a statement in the books, it's not astounding to witness Herbart finally turning away from the idealism of Fichte. This occurred in 1796 when he fired a few critical shells at some of the works of Schelling, another idealist of the era.

A Private Tutor.—About a year after this critical tussle with idealism, Herbart quit Jena and started off for Switzerland. Here he made for Bern, where he accepted a job as private tutor to the three sons of Mr. von Steiger, an eminent and potent politician. For two years, from 1797 to 1799, Herbart graced this position, and though subsequently he was able to compile tons of pages on educational theory, this brace of years constitutes his only real, practical teaching experience. Required by his prudent employer to render bimonthly reports on the conduct and progress of his students, Herbart concocted a series of letters wherein he described the methods he used. In these epistles, incidentally, are revealed snatches of what in the end was to become dominant in the

Herbartian pedagogy. Thus, for the evolution of his method, Herbart leaned on psychology. Like Rousseau, he saw in his pupils so many separate individuals, each of whom required special pedagogical attention and treatment. Topping all his educational effort, moreover, were his two big goals, namely, morality, and what he called a "many-sided interest." Of both we shall hear more anon.

GÖTTINGEN.—It was during his tutorial days with the von Steiger boys that Herbart got acquainted with the ideas of Pestalozzi. In 1799 he visited the master in person at Burgdorf. Thereafter he took a warm interest in Pestalozzian contributions, turning out several critical reviews and addresses, and doing much in general to awaken the world to the significant doings of the great Swiss. In 1802 he cast anchor at the University of Göttingen. Here he lectured on philosophy and pedagogy. Here, too, he continued his critical dissection of the Pestalozzian dicta. One of the more important critiques that he got off at this time, and also the statement of his final position on Pestalozzi, is called by the somewhat ponderous title *On the Point of View in Judging the Pestalozzian Method of Instruction.* With the appearance of this learned treatise Herbart definitely and permanently said good-bye to the pedagogy of

Pestalozzi. As an educational theorist, Herbart was now on his own. After three years of hard and high-grade work at Göttingen, a work which in the typical German way was marked by the issuance of numerous scholarly writings, Herbart was converted into a professor, in recognition, as the authorities put it, of his "gifts for teaching and talents." A year later, or to be specific, in 1809, Herbart was able to show his appreciation by publishing his celebrated *General Pedagogy,* a volume containing his main ideas on the subject.

KÖNIGSBERG.—Naturally a man as productive and capable as Professor Herbart would tend to hold an important place in the academic realm. This in 1809 became particularly bright when Herbart was asked by the University of Königsberg to take its chair in philosophy. This institute of learning, as most people know, was the intellectual citadel where the eminent Immanuel Kant had once been so active and bright. Herbart came to Königsberg. He wasn't expected, of course, to climb to the dizzy heights once scaled by the intrepid Kant. None the less, in his own way Herbart did plenty to bring him glory. Thus, for example, he founded a pedagogical seminary and a practice school. By historians this has been recorded as the original attempt on the part of the higher learning to study education scientifically. Today, of course, such study of education is standard equipment at virtually every first-rate American university. In the Herbartian practice school the usual program was in operation; that is to say, a considerable part of the teaching was done by students who were making ready to earn their shilling as regular and full-fledged schoolmasters. As usual, these rising pedagogues were observed, criticised, and if possible, improved, by their learned professors. Beside training his disciples in teaching and in scientific pedagogical research, Herbart, as is expected of every self-respecting German professor, kept on enriching the world with his scholarly works. Some of his main efforts in this direction I list herewith: *Education under Public Support. Textbook in Psychology, Psychology as a Science,* and *General Metaphysics.*

By 1833, however, Herbart's digestion couldn't stand Prussian conservatism any longer. And so he exchanged his intellectual office at Königsberg for a similar, though perhaps more congenial, post at dear old Göttingen. Here at least he could push his various intellectual inquiries without too much governmental ruction and interference. And this he proceeded to do in his own incomparable way, tossing off a stack of significant treatises in his favorite fields. In 1841, however, his health petered out, and before the year was up, Johann

Friedrich Herbart had moved on to his final reward.

His Educational Principles.—The aim of education from Rousseau's standpoint, as I have said, was to prepare the child for life by the natural development of his inborn capacities. Pestalozzi looked at education as a means of improving society. Children, according to the Pestalozzian platform, were to be prepared for society by the harmonious development of all their faculties. Herbart agreed with the aims of neither of these two gentlemen. Thus he discarded the aims of the former on the very just ground that they were too unsocial. Pestalozzi's educational aims went down the chute for the reason that the psychology on which they were based was erroneous. This was the so-called faculty psychology, and on this the sapient Herbart wasted no sympathy. For him the mind at bottom represented a unity. The purpose of education, as he saw it, was to develop personal character and proper social behavior. "The term *virtue,*" he once announced, "expresses the whole purpose of education."

Before setting out after his lofty goal, Herbart took a close and analytical glance at man's chief interests. These, he found, were many-sided. In the main, however, they flowed from two chief sources—from man's contact and experience with things and from his intercourse with people. If this was so—and the Göttingen professor was quite sure that it was—then instruction, he believed, ought to have two main branches, namely, scientific and social. The former, as always, included such delights to the mind as mathematics and the natural sciences. The latter served up language, literature, and history. To Herbart and his followers the social phase of instruction appeared the more important. History, in particular, drew their applause. Indeed, as a result of the Herbartian sway, history and literature grew into a couple of potent and respected elementary-school subjects.

INTEREST.—Having thus made up his mind on what the aims and content of education ought to be, Herbart now devoted considerable time and effort to working out a teaching procedure and method. Good and effective instruction, he finally decided, must always have interest for its helpful handmaiden. Here, of course, Herbart was proceeding on ground that was palpably safe. For no matter how versed a pedagogue may be in his subject, his teaching will fall on deaf ears unless he manages somehow to catch the imagination of his hearers. If interest invades the classroom of its own accord, then obviously all is well. But this marvelous quality, as any practical teacher at times must have noted, is sometimes as rare as honor in a stool-pigeon. At such times, Herbart contended, it is up to the officiating teacher to pump artificial interest into his pupils. Only with interest can the gates of attention, and hence effective learning, be unbolted.

Apperception.—Being much more familiar with the mysterious workings of the human mind than any of his pedagogical predecessors, Herbart, quite naturally I suppose, gave much more time to unraveling the intricacies of the learning process. Pestalozzi, it will be recalled, introduced the learner to new experiences through contact with objects. His belief was that education proceeded most easily when it went from the known to the unknown —though in this respect, as I have said, Pestalozzi was not always able to live up to his principles. Herbart accepted these Pestalozzian principles as fundamentally sound, and then in his own typically systematic way proceeded to elaborate the process whereby the unknown is assimilated in terms of the known. The doctrines he finally evolved in this domain is known as apperception. Briefly, it means that we interpret what we don't know in terms of what we do know. In teaching, this doctrine of apperception plays an obviously significant part. Thus before setting new material before the learner, the correct Herbartian would see to it that the youngster is in the right frame of mind to receive such material.

The Formal Steps.—If the idea of apperception is sound, it ought, so Herbart argued, to be applicable in any subject. Hence, he tackled the formidable job of working out a general method of teaching. This at first was composed of four steps, to wit: clearness, association, system, method. With Herbart's followers this quartet became a quintet known as the Five Formal Steps. I list them herewith: (1) *Preparation.* Following the doctrine of apperception, the child's mind is made ready to receive new material by putting him in the right emotional state and by stirring up in his mind those ideas he already has, and which will help him to assimilate the new. (2) *Presentation.* This is simply the actual statement and explanation of the new material to be learned. (3) *Association.* Here the new is related to the old. (4) *Generalization.* True to its name, this is simply the framing of a rule, principle, or definition to cover all the various particular instances lugged in in the third step. (5) *Application.* Here the learner is expected to test his understanding of the general principles he acquired in the fourth step. Briefly, this last step serves to indicate whether the learner has done his job successfully. Whether Herbart intended his formal steps to operate in each lesson or in the subject as a whole is not clear. The evidence, judging from Herbart's own practice at Göttingen, seems to sag toward the latter. More important, however, than Herbert's private inclinations in this matter of the five formal steps is the fact that his followers, particularly in America, applied the formal steps to each lesson. In time these steps became quite the rage in the normal schools of the Republic. In their way the formal steps are no doubt a fairly good method of procedure for a beginning, and hence inexperienced, teacher. Like most ready-made techniques, however, they tend in the long run to become mechanical. Certainly, they murder spontaneity in a recitation.

Correlation.—Herbart, interestingly enough, is one of the first modern educationists to bawl for correlation of subject-matter. Here again, however, he merely dropped a few casual hints, which, as in several other instances, were promptly pounced upon by his disciples and converted into an actuality. Facts, Herbart believed, ought to undergo some methodical treatment, so that when they are dished up to the pupil they will hang together. Only in this way, thought Master Herbart, can facts influence the pupil's personal behavior. While barren in their essence, these ideas on correlation, as numerous experts have pointed out, involve the very important matter of creating associations between subjects. Of this Herbart himself was aware, as witness:

> Mathematical studies, from elementary arithmetic to higher mathematics, are to be linked to the pupil's knowledge of nature, and so to his experience, in order to gain admission into his sphere of thought. Instruction in mathematics, however thorough, fails pedagogically when the ideas generated form an isolated group. They are usually soon forgotten, or if retained, contribute little toward personal worth. [1]

The astute Göttingen professor, however, appears to perceive some limitations in the territory of correlation. Unlike some of his more extreme followers, he wasn't willing to push his theory to the limit. "It would be an error," he wrote, "to argue that one who is being initiated into one subject ought to combine with that subject a second, third, or fourth, on the ground that subjects one, two, three, and four are essentially interrelated." [2] All of which of course is just sound sense.

HERBART'S FOLLOWERS.—Herbart, as I have said, went to his rest eternal in 1841. Though he had labored hard, his ideas hadn't caused much of a stir. Indeed, some two dozen years elapsed before this distinguished educator began to come into his own. And then, interestingly enough, this tardy recognition fell on his shoulders not so much through his own work, but through that of one of his disciples. This was Tuiskon Ziller, (1817-

---

[1] Herbart, J. F., *Outlines of Educational Doctrine.* 639.

[2] *op. cit.* 6219,

1883) who in 1865 published his celebrated *Basis of the Doctrine of Instruction as a Moral Force.* This was a big shot and caused quite a rumpus. It launched the parade of Herbartianism which for the next few decades was to touch so many lands. As a result of the Ziller treatise the Association for the Scientific Study of Education was created in 1868, and Ziller was adorned with its first presidency. The members of this learned sodality concentrated on the devlopment and improvement of Herbart's original ideas. Beside swelling the four formal steps into five, they developed the principle of *concentration.* This is a hybridized specimen of Herbart's correlation idea. By virtue of the concentration scheme, school instruction was to be unified around a central core study which was to reveal the "moral universe" to the pupil's mind. In the second grade, thus, *Robinson Crusoe* was to be the starting point for arithmetic, writing, reading, and morals. Beside this contribution, Ziller and his fellow-scientists propounded their celebrated *culture epochs theory.* Briefly, this is based on the biological theory of recapitulation which holds that the individual in his development from embryo to adult repeats the developmental states undergone by the species in its evolution. By analogy, the Herbartian pedagogues argued, the child in its individual cultural development should recapitulate the race's cultural evolution. To bring about this state of affairs the course of study was to be arranged accordingly. In its heyday the culture epochs theory attracted such dignitaries of the intellect as Herbart Spencer and G. Stanley Hall. But today the theory at best is fantasy with no more scientific basis than democracy or witchcraft. The next big year in the rising Herbartian tide is 1874. This was when the University of Jena opened the doors to its pedagogical seminary and practice school. In 1885 the eminent Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Rein was put in command over this academic outfit, and as a pupil of Ziller, Rein naturally operated on Zillerian lines. Jena soon evolved into a Herbartian citadel. Pedagogues from other lands flocked to the place, and as time slipped by, Jena definitely stamped the Herbartian imprint on educational thought and practice of the day. American schoolmen, more eager then than now to take their lessons from foreigners, sailed for the Jena educational atelier, and promptly absorbed a great deal of the Herbartian wisdom. When these fellows returned to the Republic, what could have been more natural than that they should toot their horns for the new pedagogy? Herbartianism, as a result, became the American vogue. As usual, numerous textbooks on the subject were turned out.[8] In 1892 the movement took on extra zest with the organization of the National Herbart Society. True to its name, this association concentrated strictly on Herbartian topics, such as interest, correlation, apperception, methods, and moral education. In 1902, when the Herbartian tide was already flowing out, this society changed its name to the National Society for the Study of Education. With this second baptism, the society also broadened its scope. By this time, however, the Herbartian dicta had already caught their main converts, and had, moreover, made their most significant contributions. These, as I have noted, were chiefly in methods of teaching and in curriculum.

PESTALOZZI AND HERBART.—So much for Herbart and the influence of his ideas. These had their crude beginnings, as we have seen, in the works of Pestalozzi. In time, however, they lifted themselves far above their source. Though the Messrs. Pestalozzi and Herbart worked in the same vast arena, the two differed singularly in some respects. A practical teacher, the former derived most of his favorite tenets from actual service on the teaching front. Herbart, on the contrary, had virtually no classroom experience. Pestalozzi was a dreamer, an idealist, foolish perhaps, but sincere, who wanted to improve the world. In his lifetime he was stirred by every conceivable sort of man—from the souse in the gutter to the Tsar of Russia. Herbart, on the other hand, was somewhat of an aristocrat with all the traditions and manners of the high-toned gentry. Though he directed his thoughts on society and its problems, Herbart had little actual contact therewith. His life, easy and peaceful in the main, was passed in the academic cloister. In one respect, however, the Göttingen professor easily and completely outclassed his Swiss inspirer. I refer here to the matter of intellect. In his thinking Pestalozzi was at times crude, illogical, unsystematic, and hence often manifestly absurd. Herbart, however, was a man of learning with an eager and excellent mind, disciplined from childhood for scholarly skirmishes into the realm of knowledge.

---

[8] Some of the more important books are the following: *Essentials of Method* (1889) by Charles De Garmo; *General Method* (1892) by Charles A. McMurray; *Method in the Recitation* (1897) by Charles A. and Frank McMurray.

THE HERBARTIAN INFLUENCE.—These differences in personality, I believe, serve to explain the differences in the pedagogy evolved by the two men. Did Herbart's mind radiate criticism, logic, and system? Then certainly it ought to find some of the weak spots in the Pestalozzian pedagogy. Certainly it ought to be able to turn out something better. And certainly, also, it ought to originate some novelties of its own. And all this, I daresay, it did—unusually well. Thus, to make a start, Herbart developed a sounder educational psychology than his predecessors—a psychology which today, true enough, has been dumped on the rubbish-pile, but which in its own day was held in high esteem. Out of the Herbartian psychology oozed a new teaching method, which again was built on a Pestalozzian base, but which in addition added a heavy coating of system and goal. It was Herbart who pointed out the psychological need for interest in instruction. It was Herbart who held up character as the aim of education. It was Herbart who blew life into the social subjects such as history, literature, and language. It was Herbart who suggested that a science of education is possible. It was Herbart who felt that progress in education rested upon experimentation. It was Herbart who threw his inquisitive lenses over man's interests and found they were many-sided. And despite his own shortcomings in the matter, it was Herbart who announced that educators needed practical experience.

Without question Herbart left his mark on education. Not, of course, that his notable record is without blemish. Like so many educational theorists, Herbart tended in his writings at times to get exceedingly windy. Metaphysics was one of his hobbies, and as a result whole parcels of his pedagogy are wrapped therein. His formal steps have been examined by such a redoubtable academician as Dr. Dewey and found wanting. His analysis of man's many-sided interests, while perhaps complete when applied to a refined and intellectual member of the *haut monde*, as exemplified by Herbart himself, is preposterously inadequate when applied to most human beings who are compelled to work for their crusts of bread, and who, hence, have a decidely potent vocational interest—whether they like it or not. The startling omission of this phase of human interests is one of the weakest links in the Herbartian pedagogy. Of course such gaudy extravagances as the culture epochs theory and concentration might well be included in the general bill of particulars against the eminent Göttingen professor. But here I prefer to hang the indictment on Herbart's followers. They, as I have duly noted, often went to wild extremes.

Chapter Five

FROEBEL

EARLY LIFE.—Six years after the birth of Herbart there was born in Thuringia another German youngster destined for great things in pedagogy. His name by birth was Froebel. By baptism, however, this was further adorned with Friedrich Wilhelm August. Like Rousseau, this Thuringian lost his mother while he was still an infant. And just as in the case of his lustrous Swiss predecessor, this early loss had considerable effect on Froebel's subsequent carreer. Froebel's father was a Lutheran pastor. As a conscientious vicar of the Lord, naturally enough, he had plenty to do. And with the unfortunate departure of his spouse the elder Froebel soon found himself busier than ever. For not only did he have to continue to minister to his communicants, but he had, in addition, to execute the numerous household duties once attended to by his lamented wife. This combination of professional and domestic activities proved entirely too great a load for the widower Froebel. And thus, to put an end to at least his housekeeping burdens, he gladly once more became a benedict.

If young Froebel had felt himself somewhat neglected before his father's second marriage, he was to be even more forlorn with the advent of the second Mrs. Froebel. Historians have set her down, somewhat too eagerly I fear, as the traditional hard-hearted step-mother. True enough, she didn't shed much sympathy on her step-son, and he, being somewhat of an over-sensitive youngster, took this treatment much to heart. In time, moreover, another infant came to the Froebels, and now of course Friedrich August Wilhelm got less attention than ever. This lack of understanding between the boy and his step-mother, together with the heavy-coated discipline that had been hung on the Froebel home by the lad's zealous and evangelical father, served to make the sensitive Friedrich anything but happy. To escape his deadening environment he took to the woods and fields. Here, to the invisible applause of Rousseau, he observed and studied the strange phenomena of nature. Being his own companion for virtually most of the time, the boy very naturally developed an introspective streak which, as the years went by, began to garb itself in the uncanny frock of mysticism. Thus, as he wandered about among the local flora and fauna, young Froebel began to puzzle over the riddle of life. What is it all about? Is there a connectedness in all things? Is there unity? These and similar weighty questions skidded through his brain which, young and untrained as it was, obviously could furnish its owner no immediate answer.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION.—At the age of fifteen Froebel, without being consulted in the matter, was apprenticed to a forester. Such a connection of course had its advantages. Beside the purely vocational possibilities, the boy had plenty of opportunities to continue his study of nature. On the other hand, there were disadvantages too. The boy was still too much alone, and though Froebel may by this time have become quite accustomed to his solitude, this wasn't especially conducive to a normal and social outlook upon life. His introspection and his mysticism in other words tended to be stimulated. It was during this period, however, that Froebel's interest in the scientific basis of nature began. A local medico lent him some books on the subject, and through these the rising forester waded with zest. So deeply did these works touch their reader, that Froebel decided to increase his scientific knowledge in a very real way by attending the University of Jena. In the world of the intellect Jena in that era was up-and-doing. Romanticism was dripping from its faucets, and such capable fellows as Tieck, Novalis, and the Schlegels were the masters of ceremony. In philosophy, as I have already noted, idealism was being served up under the expert direction of Fichte. In the natural sciences the university had gone over to the evolutionists. Naturally, when Pastor Froebel heard that his son wanted to go to such a wicked school as Jena, he kicked up a considerable rumpus. But in the end he made sufficient though reluctant concessions to allow his Friedrich to enroll at Jena. Here the boy quickly succumbed to the magic of the place. Fate, however, had other things in mind for the young student. After a few years Froebel had to break off his academic life. The circumstances weren't very pleasant, but the hyper-sensitive Froebel, I daresay, took them much too seriously. At all events, he returned home thoroughly blue and disillusioned.

FROM SURVEYOR TO SCHOOLMASTER.—For the next few years Froebel drifted without a rudder. Vocationally, he tried his hand at several things, from land-surveying to the management of country estates. Most of the jobs he attempted, however, went against the Froebelian grain, and hence none of them made much of an appeal. Finally in 1805 he started out for Frankfurt to study architecture. Here he met a Dr. Grüner, the head of a Pestalozzian model school. Taking an interest in Froebel, and convinced that this sad young man from the woodlands of Thuringia had the makings of an excellent teacher, the doctor offered him a schoolmastership in his academy. This Froebel accepted, and soon he was boiling over in high spirits. "From the first," he later confessed, "I found something I had always longed for, but always missed; as if my life had at last discovered its native element."

YVERDON.—Now that Froebel had apparently found himself, he began to make some very necessary life adjustments. Not only did he undertake a close study of Pestalozzian principles, but he also began in time to develop some pedagogical ideas of his own. Interested in what the up-to-date moderns sometimes call creative education, Froebel experimented in a small way along this line. Here he made considerable use of such modeling materials as paper, cardboard, and wood. Finally, in 1808, he made up his mind to trek to Yverdon, then in its prime. Here he remained for two years studying and teaching under Pestalozzi. Needless to say, the Yverdon master stirred Froebel to his most secret recesses. When he finally left the Institute Froebel carried away many ideas. Most important of all these, at least as far as his personal development in the realm of pedagogics is concerned, was his interest in the educational value of play and music.

BERLIN—ARMY—INSTITUTE.—Departing from Yverdon, Froebel now returned to his university studies. First he made for Göttingen, but a year later, in 1812, he gravitated to Berlin to specialize in mineralogy under the guidance of the reputed Professor Weiss. Here, interestingly enough, he finally plucked that mystic law of unity which he had been chasing so long. Through his scientific studies he became "convinced of the demonstrable connection in all cosmic development." Or as he put it another time: "Thereafter my rocks and crystals served me as a mirror wherein I might discern mankind, and man's development and history." Meanwhile, however, these *études* with rocks and crystals were interrupted by the inconsiderate Napoleon. It was the time, as students of history well know, when all good Germans were called to shoulder muskets against the bold Corsican. Froebel the mystic, disguised as a soldier, was one of these defenders of the Fatherland. For about a year he served as a German doughboy, and though he didn't particularly relish the military way of doing things, he at least turned in a satisfactory performance. In 1814 he returned to his rocks and crystals at Berlin. Two years later, after having turned down a Stockholm professorship, he opened a little private school of his own with the high-sounding title "The Universal German Institute of Education." Run on Pestalozzian lines, Froebel's school featured play, music, and self-activity. After a decade of rough going, it was finally knocked cold by adverse finances. Before it finally went out, however Froebel had put together and published his *magnum opus*. This was ~~*The*~~ *Education of Man*.

Burgdorf and Blankenburg.—Froebel now went across the border to Switzerland to the town of Willisau. Here, unfortunately, he encountered heavy broadsides from the local evangelical clergy who, thoroughly misunderstanding Froebel's ideas, denounced their owner in no uncertain terms. At a public examination, however, Froebel turned in results so high and astounding as to put a thoroughgoing quietus on his opposition. In 1855, the Swiss government, then on one of its progressive sprees, took note of Froebel and his high doings, and invited him to set up his booth at Burgdorf. Curiously enough, Froebel was put to work in the very castle once used by Pestalozzi. Here the Thuringian educationist fashioned training courses for teachers. During the last few years, while mulling over his pedagogical beliefs, Froebel had gradually convinced himself that the most needed educational reforms of the day belonged in the stage of early childhood. "All school education," he averred, "was yet without proper initial foundation." And also: "Until the education of the nursery was reformed, nothing solid and worthy could be attained." With these things in mind, he now concentrated on the development of games, plays, songs, and operations involving self-activity. Finally, in 1837, Froebel returned to the Fatherland. Here in the town of Blankenburg, one of the beauty spots of Thuringia, he founded a school for youngsters between the ages of three and seven. At first this new school was known to customers by the horrendous name of *Kleinkinderbeschäftigunganstalt*—which in itself ought to be ample evidence of the fact that as a business man Froebel was an ignoramus. In time, however, even Froebel came to realize the outlandish nature of this name. And then he more than made amends for his original atrocity by rechristening his school the *Kindergarten*, a name which on the scrolls of human history, I daresay, is destined to be permanent.

The Last Years.—In this school at Blankenburg Froebel developed his ideas concerning the education of young children. The materials he had thought out in Switzerland he now expanded into a system. In the main this was composed of the so-called *play songs* for mother and child; a half-dozen *gifts,* or geometrical forms; and the *occupations* whereby the child applied to various constructions the principles he had learned through the gifts. Beside recasting and strenghtening his pedagogical ideas and paraphernalia, Froebel was also busy with his pen. His most important publication during this period was his *Mother and Play Songs.*

Just like Pestalozzi, however, Froebel was a child when it came to the matter of money. By 1844 his school was devoured by debt, and hence had to close its doors. Froebel now mounted the lecture platform; and for the next five years he expounded the main features of his system with a fair degree of success. By 1849 he let himself down at Liebenstein in Saxe-Meiningen. It was here that he encountered the celebrated Baroness Bertha von Marenholtz Bülow-Wendhausen. Highly interested in Froebel's pedagogics, the Baroness, with a flare for publicity, was just the right person to put the shy and impractical Froebel on the map. From the middle of the nineteenth century down to her death in 1893, Baroness Bertha worked with eager zeal to make Europe cognizant of the Froebelian contribution. The descending years of Froebel's life bade fair to be happy. Time had taken most of the sting out of his early defeats. Through the active altruism of the good Baroness, moreover, his main educational ideas were at last becoming known and accepted on an international scale. But the gods, it appears, were bent on writing tragedy. Just as Froebel's life had been in the beginning, so it was to be at the end. Thus in 1851 the Prussian government, soaked to the gills in post-revolutionary reaction, put the ban in its domain on the kindergarten. This strange edict was due, curiously enough, to the Prussian inability to differentiate accurately between the teachings of Froebel and those of a revolutionary nephew and namesake. Due originally to a bureaucratic blunder, the interdict, however, wasn't lifted until 1860. Meanwhile, however, its weight had fallen heavily on Froebel's health, and before the end of 1852 the Thuringian passed away humiliated and disillusioned.

THE FROEBELIAN PEDAGOGY.—Froebel's thinking, as I have said, traveled in the high airlane of mysticism. His whole stream of thought, and hence a good part of his pedagogics, had a mystic smack. As a mystic, he hurled off symbols, analogies, and hidden meanings in the same easy way that politicians emit sonorous platitudes. Today Froebel the Mystic is no longer in good standing with practical pedagogues. His kindergarten, however, stripped of its gaudy theologico-mystical trimmings, is encountered in most civilized lands. This is due, I believe, to the fact that the kindergarten in the main is grounded on sound sociological and psychological foundations. Education, Froebel believed, ought to develop the free personality that lurks in every child. At bottom such education is self-development. Like Pestalozzi, Froebel felt that mothers are ideal teachers. But unlike his Swiss teacher, Froebel held that mothers must be trained for their important job. Though he didn't throw his kisses at the culture epochs theory, Froebel caressed the belief that the child repeats the development of the race. Since the Thuringian was ever on the prowl for unity in life, it seems perfectly understandable that he tried to base education on the principle of unity in all things. Educationally, I suppose, this has the air of correlation, though it is by no odds the correlation espoused by the learned Herbartians. The subjects taught, Froebel felt, should be related to each other and to life. Boys should construct buildings, for practical work is educative. Contact with nature, too, is educative. Formal subjects, Froebel argued, should be tied up with practical work. Like Rousseau, though for different reasons, Froebel looked upon education as the development of a child's inborn capacities. Again like Rousseau, he saw that youngsters are primarily active rather than intellectual creatures. Their chief aim and function is to be up and doing. On this human tendency, Froebel felt, education should build. Thus one of the big features of the kindergarten is the attention it bestows on pupil self-activity. This in the main, however, is motor self-activity. Educationally, the child's self-activity, so Froebel correctly believed, is to be directed. It is, moreover, to be harnessed to the child's own interests. Children are to learn by doing. "To learn a thing in life and through doing," Froebel maintained, "is much more developing, cultivating, and strengthening than to learn it merely through verbal communication of ideas." [1] Here Froebel is plainly on echo of Pestalozzi. However, Froebel palpably goes his master, Pestalozzi, one better, for after all the latter's sense perception at best was mainly passive observation.

Like Herbart, but unlike Rousseau, Froebel saw education as a socializing force. "Man," he said, "should develop in harmony, peace, and joy within himself and with those around him, in accordance with human nature and destiny; and this should continue through all stages of development, and in all the various circumstances of life, in the family and school, in domestic and public life." [2] The Froebelian schoolroom hence took on the air of a miniature society wherein all the social virtues were displayed and developed.

THE KINDERGARTEN.—All these principles, self-development, expression, and social co-operation, as might be expected, are set to work in the Froebelian kindergarten. This, as is well known, is a pre-school organization. At bottom it is founded on the idea that the early years of a child's life are of great educational significance. "Whatever has to be done for the human being," the Froebelians believe, "should be done in his earliest years, and that persistently." [3] In the kindergarten self-activity and expression, as I have already said, are essential. Movement, gesture, play, song, color, the story, and human activities are the main ingredients of the kindergartner's technique. Three types of materials are employed in this work, namely, (1) the *Mother Play and Nursery Songs,* (2) the gifts, (3) the occupations. In the songs, Froebel believed, that he had laid down the fundamental ideas of his educational principles. The gifts and occupations, as I have already hinted, were the paraphernalia which aimed to stimulate the youngster's motor expression. The gifts consisted of materials whose form was fixed, such as spheres, cubes, cylinders, and so on. The occupations were materials that underwent change while in use, like clay, sand, and cardboard. To develop the child's social nature, the kindergarten was converted, as we have seen, into a small society. The illustrious Baroness von Bülow once called the kindergarten "a miniature state for children; wherein the young citizen can learn to move freely but with consideration for his little fellows." In such a Tom Thumb state, naturally enough, the emphasis will be on social participation and co-operation. Group activities, as the moderns term them, were here on lavish tap.

---

[1] Rousseau and Froebel, F. W. A., *The Education of Man,* (Hailmann's translation) p. 279.

[2] Heinemann, A. H., *Letters of Froebel,* p. 43.

---

[3] Franks, F., *The Kindergarten System, its Origin and Development,* p. 160

THE FROEBELIAN INFLUENCE.—It has been duly noted by careful pedagogues that Froebel has left his mark upon the schools. Did he die humiliated and disgusted? Then plainly he was a bad guesser. For not only do kindergartens flourish in most of the democratic domains today, but many of the Froebelian principles are actually soaring to the regular elementary school. The idea that the child is an active animal, for example, is certainly no longer a monoply of the kindergarten. So, too, the notion that play has educational value. And so also with bookless schools, self-expression, learning by doing, motor training, and pyramids of other principles engraved on the Froebelian platform. Beside making play a respectable school activity, Froebel gave a potent impetus to the growth of manual training. Unlike Rousseau, Froebel didn't advocate training in handwork for economic and social reasons. Unlike Pestalozzi, he didn't bawl for manual training on the grounds that instruction therein would help a child to acquire knowledge. Froebel wanted manual training simply as a creative activity. The Thuringian wasn't the first of modern educators to plead for the manual activities.

Nor was he the only one. But the roaring success of his kindergarten together with his sound reasons for the support of manual training tended, I believe, to be excellent propaganda for the movement.

Manual Training.—The first land to grace its schools with manual training was Finland. Here in 1858, under the direction of Uno Cygnæus, a Froebelian devotee, courses were set up in woodcarving, basketry, and metal work. From the land of the Finns, the movement went over to the Swedes, whose government in 1872 introduced the so-called sloyd work into the Swedish schools. At the outset this work had an economic and industrial motive. Finally, however, this succumbed, and the sloyd aimed chiefly to develop the ability to use tools plus the acquisition of a certain amount of manual dexterity. Needless to say, the manual-training idea in various guises spread to other lands. The United States first embraced it, curiously enough, through the influence of an exhibit made by the Russians in Philadelphia in 1876 at the Centennial Exhibition. Here the Muscovites displayed with pride some of the wood and iron work turned out by the pupils of the Imperial Technical Institute at Moscow. At first introduced in the high schools, manual training in some form has since invaded the lower schools. Today it is on hand in virtually all first-rate urban school systems.

FROEBEL'S INFLUENCE OUTSIDE OF GERMANY.—Though the Prussians put the kindergarten on the blacklist for nine years, other countries were more gracious in their attitude. Through the influence of the gifted Baroness von Bülow propaganda for the kindergarten was scattered in England, France, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, and after 1860, when the Prussian ban was lifted, in Germany. The greatest development of the kindergarten on the continent is probably found in Switzerland. Postwar Russia has developed and given considerable thought to the development of pre-school education. Some of the Froebelian principles are being applied, but these perforce have been adulterated by the communist philosophy. Today, I daresay, the kindergarten is found in some form or other in virtually every first-rate nation.

Probably in no other land has the kindergarten idea been more cordially saluted than in America. The first kindergartners to open up their shops in the Republic were German emigrés who had left the Fatherland after the frustrated Revolution of 1848. Most of these original kindergartens were small. Designed for the German-speaking offspring of these self-exiled German liberals, they were conducted in German. The first of such kindergartens opened its doors in 1855 at Watertown, Wisconsin. A pupil of Froebel and the wife of a celebrated

German-American, Mrs. Carl Schurz was the foundress. Through the influence of these early German kindergartens, and also through the puissant writings of Henry Bernard, the kindergarten idea began to make headway throughout the realm. In 1860 it invaded Boston. The first kindergarten to be established in that eminent town was private, and under the command of the enthusiastic Miss Elizabeth Peabody. This Bostonian school was the first American kindergarten to be conducted in the native tongue. Eight years after the establishment of Miss Peabody's school, a private training school for nascent kindergartners was opened. This also belonged to Boston. Finally, in 1873, the first American public-school kindergarten was opened up for business under the direction of Miss Susan Blow. This was achieved at St. Louis, and came as a result of the invitation of Superintendent William T. Harris. Today, as I have announced, kindergartens are scattered all over the Republic.

Chapter Six

SPENCER

SCIENCE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel have gone down in pedagogy as the educational psychologizers. Hanging their chief interest on child study, these three gentlemen concentrated in the main on fashioning better teaching methods. Each one, in his own way, moreover, perceived some sort of a social purpose in the business of education. Briefly, it was felt that at bottom education should prepare one to live happily with one's fellow. But each one of these masters, as I have duly noted, struck out for this goal in his own private way. However, as these three educators busied themselves with the hammering out of their various pedagogic dicta, society itself was undergoing some vast and significant changes. The nineteenth century in which this triumvirate lived and labored was also the era of Darwin, Tyndall, and Wallace. It saw the rise of the evolutionary revelation. It saw the development of pure and applied science. Not since the seventeenth century had the scientific dens rumbled so ominously. On all the scientific fronts advances were steadily reported, and the world began to hear much about new developments in chemistry, physics, biology, in anatomy and physiology, in embryology, histology, gynecology, and acres of others. In the realm of application the world's eyes were bulged by a hemorrhage of invention and discovery—a scientific effusion which ranged from the cotton gin to the locomotive, from telegraphy to transatlantic cables, from chloroform to a whole farrago of antiseptics.

SCIENCE AND THE CLASSICS.—With such transcendental changes falling on all sides, men, naturally enough, began to show the effects. Thus amid the steady and relentless transformation of his environs, he adjusted perforce his behavior, his culture, his *Weltanschauung*. The world, in short, was no longer quite the same. What had started in the microcosm of the laboratory was now pouring all over the macrocosm of society. How did all these transformations touch the schools? Did these, reflecting the new times, embrace the new culture? Obviously, if at bottom education is actually the mirror of society, then the schools should have shown in some way the influence of these new social forces. Science and the newer disciplines, in brief, might reasonably have been expected to come in for some serious consideration on the part of schoolmen. But the houses of learning were manned, as usual, chiefly by pedagogic conservatives who were inclined to believe that the supreme value of a subject lay not in the subject itself, but in the mental training that could be squeezed therefrom. To these members of the pedagogic right wing the old traditional training, based on a bewhiskered *Kultur,* seemed not only adequate but perfect, and hence beyond compare. Were the sciences bawling for a place in the curriculum? Then how were they superior to the vaunted classics as instruments of mental drill? How, indeed, were they even remotely as good? Plainly, the advocates of science would have to dig deep for a satisfactory answer. Briefly, their response was fired from two barrels. Thus they contended that what mattered in education was not so much method and drill, but the actual content of what was studied. The classics, they argued, despite all their majestic claims were sadly out of step with the modern beat. The sciences, on the other hand, were not only in step, but were in fact the drum-major and brass band that gave contemporary life its tempo. The second claim of the apostles of the new culture centered on the subject of mental training. In brief, it simply refuted the idea that the classics held a monopoly in this department. If subjects were taught to train the mind, it was argued, then the sciences could do the job just as well as the classics. Today, through potent blasts from the psychologists, this idea of training the mind is out of date, and no self-respecting schoolman, I daresay, openly subscribes thereto.

HERBERT SPENCER.—One of the most gifted protagonists of the new discipline was the Anglo-Saxon, Herbert Spencer. He was born at Derby in 1820. His parents on both sides were worshippers of the Wesleyan rite, which in those days was a downright radical way of behaving. From his father, young Herbert inherited a streak of individualism which was to make itself felt *fortissimo* as the years rolled on. Spencer, Jr., was a lazy lad, and his father was indulgent. Finally, when the boy turned thirteen, he was dispatched to study under a paternal uncle who taught at Hinton. The uncle, interestingly enough, was reputed for his disciplinary powers. But even more interesting, perhaps, is the fact that young Herbert, apparently cared nothing for such reputations, and promptly ran away from his relative. In three days the boy was back at Derby after having walked a distance of more than a hundred miles, and dieted along the route on bread and beer. None the less the youth was made to return to Hinton. Here he studied for three years. Yet if we take Spencer at his word the time was largely wasted. "That neither in boyhood or youth," he writes, "did I receive a single lesson in English, and that I have remained entirely without formal knowledge of syntax down to the present hour, are facts which should be known; since their implications are at variance with assumptions universally accepted." [1]

Spencer, I am inclined to contend, was not the deep reader that some of his biographers limn. He got through six books of the *Iliad,* and then gave it up, feeling that he "would rather give a large sum of money than read to the end." When he was thirty he tackled Kant, but soon decided that the German philosopher was an ass, and hence not worth bothering about. On the word of his secretary, we learn that Spencer never completed any book on science, and that he confected his first book on *Social Statics* after having read only one other treatise on the subject. And even that was of antedeluvian vintage. Obviously, if Spencer was educated, it was not through books. The thousands of facts that he sprinkled over his thousands of arguments he sucked in through direct observation rather than through reading. He has been pictured as "lynx-eyed for every fact." He was, in brief, a self-educated man, who seized his learning as he lived.

Professionally, he went to work as a railway engineer. In time, however, he forsook such prosaic things as trains and tresles, and gave his favor to the more colorful calling of journalism. This was in 1847 when he became editor of *The Economist*. It was in the writing arena that he did his most significant work—a work which culminated in his treatise on synthetic philosophy. Like the Anglo-Saxon of fiction, Spencer was singularly bare of humor. Passion in him was a nonentity. On the other hand, he was logical and precise almost to a phobia. All these traits, as one might expect, are radiated in his style. "It has been remarked," he once said, "that I have an unusual faculty of exposition—set forth my data and reasonings and conclusions with a clearness not common." Evolution was his god, and he saw it in every science as well as biology. His *magnum opus* was but an expression of this idea. And if he finally did get it into print, it was only after a terrific fight against poor health, low finances, the hysterical sputterings of his foes, and myriads of other obstacles.

---

[1] Spencer, *Autobiography,* p. vii.

WHAT KNOWLEDGE IS OF MOST WORTH?—In the field of education Spencer had no practical experience. Indeed, even his reading on the subject appears to have been of the barest hue. Such handicaps—if they are handicaps—wouldn't however, have stopped Spencer. His *Social Statics* he turned out, as I have said, after having consumed only one book on the subject. Likewise his *Biology*. And almost likewise his

Psychology. In pedagogics he seems to have been privy to the ideas of Pestalozzi—but that, I am inclined to believe, was his limit. Obviously a man of the Spencerian calibre, with his devotion for the Darwinian credo, his intense participation in modern life, and particularly his contempt for formal education, would be at odds with the devotees of the old-style culture. This he undertook to show in a series of four essays which later were put together under the head of *Education.* The first of these treatises appeared in 1859 under the significant title *What Knowledge is of Most Worth?* The function of education Spencer maintained, was "to prepare us for complete living." In his characteristic way he then put his scalpel on life to find out, as he hinted, just what constituted complete living. After having chiseled away for a time he concluded that in the main there were only five life activities and needs. I list them herewith in virtually his own words: (1) Those that minister directly to self-preservation. (2) Those which secure for one the necessities of life. (3) Those which have for their end the rearing and disciplining of offspring. (4) Those involved in the maintenance of proper political and social relations. (5) Those which deal with leisure. Putting his microscope over each of these gallant five, Spencer now concluded that the knowledge most worth is science.

> What knowledge if of most worth? The uniform reply is—Science. This is the verdict on all counts. For direct self-preservatoin, or the maintenance of life and health, the all-important knowledge is—Science. For that indirect self-preservation, which we call gaining a livelihood, the knowledge of greatest value is—Science. For the due discharge of parental functions, the proper guidance is to be found only in—Science. For that interpretation of national life, past and present, without which the citizen cannnot rightly regulate his conduct, the indispensable key is—Science. Alike for the most perfect production and highest enjoyment of art in all its forms, the needful preparation is still—Science. And for purposes of discipline—intellectual, moral, religious—the most efficient study is, once more —Science. [2]

A pretentious plea without adequate proof for its contentions? Perhaps. But at least novel and well written, and hence widely consumed. Under the Spencerian blow pipe, the defenders of the old culture were at last given something to worry about. For not only had the man turned the established educational values upside-down; he had also snared for himself a vast and appreciative audience.

SOME SPENCERIAN PRINCIPLES.—Spencer's main thunder came in his first essay. His three other monographs, while interesting in numerous ways, were for the most part quite ancient stuff.

---

[2] Spencer, H., *Education,* chap. I.

Thus this Anglo-Saxon scholar held such familiar believes that education should go from the old to the new, from the concrete to the abstract from the empirical to the rational. The whole educative business, moreover, should be grounded firmly on interest. Spencer, as I have already stated, embraced the culture-epoch nonesense, and sought, like the Herbartians, to construct a curriculum based thereon. With Rousseau, he held to the idea of natural punishments as the foundation of moral training. Like most latter-day schoolmen, Spencer was opposed to the formal, ritualistic, and memoriter sort of education. With Montaigne he believed that *savoir par coeur n'est pas savoir*—to know by heart is not to know. In the Spencerian pedagogic program plenty of space was reserved for physical training, and here the English savant voted for the main ideas of John Locke. He did not, however, cast much favor on the immortal John's "hardening process." He believed that on the whole grown-ups demanded entirely too much from their youngsters; that the latter in consequence were often overtaxed; and that hence they weren't fit to fight the battle of life. Like most educators of his day, Spencer accepted the notion of general mental power and its transfer from one intellectual area to another. He was, in other words, a formal disciplinarian. But, as I have explained, he thought that science and not the classics was the magic that wrought all this mental training.

SPENCER'S INFLUENCE.—The influence of Spencer isn't so far to seek. Though he was cocksure, and at times pathetically narrow, yet he knew how to argue his cause. What he formulated in words was after all simply a clear statement of the leading ideas of the first-rate thinkers of his era, and the discussions which rained down after his pronouncements served admirably to wash up the pedagogical heavens. Through the various bulls which he emitted, the schools were vitally and permanently affected. The installation of a so-called "modern side" into the tradition-oozing English secondary school is but one sample of the Spencerian influence. The rise of science as a school subject, on all the school levels, is another. The acceptance of the Spencerian dogmas, in their major essence, by the redoubtable and puissant Charles W. Eliot is still another. A professor of chemistry, Eliot eventually soared to a Harvard presidency. His demand that the sciences be given a respectable place in the curriculum has been generally accepted. True to the Spencerian spirit, moreover, Eliot sought to loosen the traditional course of study by the introduction of the so-called free elective system. Today, however, this right of election in studies in the colleges, is, as is well known, no longer the vogue. Not only hosannas, of course, were poured on Spencer. Even today, when the classics admittedly are on the run, the advocates of the old and the newer subjects still lay on with their broadswords. Many of the questions that Spencer presumed to answer are still unanswered. The training he offered was primarily cerebral. It had little place for the spirit and the emotions. At bottom it merely bartered a lop-sided linguistic training for an equally lop-sided scientific training. The weakness in Spencer, as Horne has shown with excellent logic, is "that he does not synthesize. Too much of real life falls outside his view." [3]

---

[3] Horne, Herman, H., "Complete Living as the Goal of Education," *Bulletin of High Points,* xi, No. 9, p. 3. Complete living, according to the Horne platform, has seven phases, to wit: physical, intellectual, moral, æsthetic, social, vocational. spiritual.

Part Two

NATIONS AND SYSTEMS

Chapter Seven

GERMANY

BEGINNINGS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—Of all the great modern nations Prussia [1] was the first to secularize its schools and to mold them into a potent instrument of the state. The de-churching operation, as might be expected, was a slow one. Beginning in the eighteenth century, the state's interest in education was launched in a serious way by Frederick William I (1713-40), a typical Hohenzollern with boundless faith in organization and efficiency. From the royal brain of Frederick William there flowed several decrees which in one way or other regulated the schools. The first, and probably the most significant, was flung down in 1717. In brief, this stipulated that wherever schools existed children should be made to attend daily in winter, and at least once a week in summer. Lest parents might be inclined to misunderstand this order from the throne, the decree was outfitted with a special set of excellent teeth which warned the burghers of "vigorous punishment" for failure to obey. The same manifesto, interestingly enough, provided that the tuition of the poor should be paid out of the community poor box. The poor, in other words, could not use their poverty as an excuse to keep their offispring out of school. As the years slipped by, the king gave further proof of his advanced educational ideas. Thus with the help of state funds he set himself the rather considerable task of developing the rural schools. Then, apparently realizing that schools and attendance regulations are only the bare bones of the educational *corpus,* the king brought about the establishment of the first teachers' training school at Stettin.

---

[1] Education in Germany is a matter of state autonomy. True, the Federal Constitution of 1919 does make certain educational prescriptions that are to hold for the whole nation. But beyond these general regulations the several states have complete educational freedom. In a sense, therefore, there is really no *German* educational system. Historically, I am inclined to believe, the Prussian system has the most to contribute. Certainly it has left its mark on education in most of the German States.

FREDERICK THE GREAT AND THE SCHOOLS.—Frederick William's son was the great Frederick (1740-86.) The friend of philosophers, musicians, writers, and men of learning, Frederick the Great was perhaps the most intelligent and capable, but also one of the most brazen and villainous, of the so-called enlightened despots who adorned Europe in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Frederick, as everyone knows, was a forward-looker. For forty-six years he warmed the throne of Prussia, and during this long spell he worked zealously to advance and improve the state. This, though

Frederick never admitted it in public like the bragging Louis XIV of France, in practice was mainly Frederick himself. Building on the educational base so sedulously set up by his father, Frederick, just like his royal pater, brought down a veritable cloudburst of educational ukases. The most significant of these were the celebrated Prussian School Codes of 1763 and 1765. Of these, the first was drawn up because "instruction of youth had come to be greatly neglected," and because "young people were growing up in stupidity and ignorance." To scotch this sad state, Frederick ordained compulsory education for all youngsters between the ages of five and thirteen, or in certain instances, fourteen. Adorned with all the garnishings of a first-rate education law, the Code of 1763 fixed and regulated such details as hours of instruction, tuition fees, scholarships, curricula, textbooks, the licensing of schoolmasters, and so on. It provided, interestingly enough, for a school census, as well as fines for parents who might forget to obey the law. Plowing in the same furrow as its illustrious predecessor, the 1765 Code sought in the main to bring light and order to the Catholic schools of Silesia.

Despite the fact that a puissant royal arm was behind this brace of Prussian regulations, they both stirred up a considerable ruction. To enforce the new Codes obviously required a vast amount of money. But this, then as now, was not always available. Parents grumbled, for they felt they were taxed enough already without being assessed for this new-fangled thing called compulsory education. Some fathers and mothers, moreover, looking upon their offspring as an economic gift from God, were reluctant to take their children from their work. And naturally enough, the reverened clergy, though they still had a mighty grip on the schools, weren't very eager to support a set of regulations which fortified the secular arm. Hence for many decades, despite Hohenzollern efficiency, there was a colossal gap between the school law on paper and its actual enforcement. In principle, however, Frederick had cast the essential chassis of the state system of education. The completed job was to be assembled into a working actuality early in the nineteenth century.

THE *Oberschulkollegium* AND THE CODE OF 1794.—In 1786 Frederick went to the Hohenzollern Valhalla. His successor, the second Frederick William, was a conservative on almost every count, and hence not much educational progress can be pinned to his name. True, the Baron von Zedlitz, a former educational adviser of Frederick the Great, did obtain the creation of the *Oberschulkollegium.* This, in plain terms, was simply a central board of school administration. Its chief reason for being was that it was expected to supplant the local church boards. Its members, interestingly enough, were to be lay educational experts, who even in those days, it seems, were abundant. Frederick William, however, unwilling to offend the Prussian clergy, packed the *Oberschulkollegium* with pastors instead of lay experts, thus disintegrating Baron Zedlitz's idea of state control into an ineffective puff of vapor, meaning precisely nothing. The idea, however, had its sound qualities, and hence it couldn't be altogether submerged. Historically, the *Oberschulkollegium* marks the transition from clerical administration of schools—under state direction—to unadulterated and expert state administration under a central board. Though Frederick William was far from a success, as Prussian kings go, his reign saw the publication of the General Civil Code. Completed in 1794, this staggering job had been launched by the indefatigable Frederick the Great when he appointed a number of his most eminent and sapient savants and jurisconsults to codify the Prussian Law. For the development of Prussian secular education the Code of 1794 is of a significance beyond compare. Its most important educational stipulation reads, thus:

> Schools and universities are state institutions, charged with the instruction of youth in useful information and

> scientific knowledge. Such institutions may be established only with the knowledge and consent of the state. All public schools and educational institutions are under the supervision of the state, and are at all times subject to its examination and inspection.

As I have said, however, the reigning monarch was afraid to risk the wrath of his holy clerks, and so for a time the educational provisoes of the Code of 1794 was enforced only in an elastic way. But eventually the situation changed, and the stipulations I have just cited became the mark of the Prussian system of state education. Indeed, as other lands fell in line, and began to set up their own systems of secular education, they marched in the main to the educational aria of the Prussian Code of 1794.

When the colorless Frederick William II finally moved on to his bliss eternal, his crown passed to a successor who in weakness and vacillation outstripped even his drab predecessor. This was Frederick William III (1797-1840). In his reign the powerful state of Prussia, so sedulously assembled by the more capable and civilzed members of the Hohenzollern species, slid steadily down to its nadir. Finally, as is well known, the Prussians were overwhelmed at Jena in 1806 by Napolean and his French crusaders. By the Treaty of Tilsit which followed in the wake of Jena the dismayed and beaten Prussians were further humiliated. Briefly, what had taken almost a century to put together was now in a few months turned into a tattered memory.

REFORMS AFTER JENA.—But Jena and Tilsit proved splendiferous lessons. Determined like all repentant sinners to purge itself, Prussia now shambled to the mourners' bench. Old and callous abuses were kicked into the gutter, and reforms were undertaken all along the line. Education in particular, as usual under such conditions, was to be thoroughly overhauled and renovated. Indeed, education, it appears, was to be the magic philtre that was to set the tottering state on its legs once more. Patriotic worthies harangued the populace and assured it that Prussia would certainly be saved. Even the King for a time set up a magnificent glow. "We shall and will gain in intrinsic power and splendor," he divined, "and therefore it is my earnest wish that the greatest attention be paid to public education." His minister Stein, a very capable and sensible fellow, also talked in flowing terms. He said:

> We proceed from the fundamental principle, to elevate the moral, reilgious, and patriotic spirit in the nation, to instil into it again courage, self-reliance, and readiness to sacrifice everything for national honor and for independence from the foreigners. . . . To attain this end, we must rely on the education and instruction of the young.

The first thing that went by the board when the educational renovators got busy was the celebrated *Oberschulkollegium.* Originally intended as a lay board, this august body, as I have said, had slipped into the hands of the clergy. To get rid of the ecclesiastical influence, the board was now dismantled (1808) and replaced by a Department of Public Instruction which was to be operated as a branch of the State Department of the Interior. Subsequently (1817) the Department was converted into an independent Ministry for Spiritual, Educational, and Medical Affairs. The first chief of the new department was Wilhelm von Humboldt, a gifted and farsighted gentleman, who in his few years in office effected an imposing series of significant, educational reforms. Through his warm support, for example, the University of Berlin was founded in 1809. In a small way this new house of the intellect was to compensate for the loss of Halle, Göttingen, and other universities which the Prussians had signed away at Tilsit. From the first Berlin was manned by a magnificent and capable faculty which soon proceeded to make its mark. At the bottom of the educational system, in the elementary school, the main reforms came in the guise of method and content. Pestalozzian ideas, as I have explained elsewhere, became the fashion. Thus in 1808 the Prussian government dispatched seventeen of its pedagogues to Switzerland, paying their way for three years to study under the Swiss master, and to warm themselves, as the state romantically put it, "at the great fire which burns in the heart of this man." When the chosen seventeen returned to their homeland they were transformed into provincial superintendents, directors of training schools, and similar magnificoes. In 1809 Pestalozzian idealism got another lift when the Prussians fetched into their confines one of the Swiss educator's pupils, Carl August Zeller, and had him organize a Pestalozzian normal school. In the domain of elementary instruction the subjects were hitched to patriotism. Geography, history, and the mother tongue, were limned in a beauteous, nationalistic coloration. Even music, curiously enough, was to get in its patriotic innings. Religion, laying less stress on catechism and doctrine, now intoned lofty messages on humility, self-sacrifice, love of country, and above all, obedience to authority. Physical training, with its health and military values, would obviously have been expected to come in for new prestige. To gymnastics, hence, the government readily gave a salute of twenty-one guns.

Nor did the reforming scholastics overlook the secondary schools. Thus in 1812 all classical schools were baptised *Gymnasien.* [2] In return for this distinction they were to meet standards determined by the state. The leaving examination (*Maturitätsprüfung*), once denounced by the reverend wearers of the cloth, was now revived (1812). Controlled by the state, these quizzes became the determining basis for admission to the higher learning. True to the spirit of the age, the curriculum was soundly standardized. Latin, Greek, German, mathematics, history, geography, religion, and science were required. [3] Another sweet bone was thrown to teacher-training when prospective gymnasial pedagogues were made to pass a very stiff examination, to be grounded, interestingly enough, on university training in the secondary-school subjects. Such tests were to be given for the state by the university authorities. To train prospective *Gymnasium* teachers, pedagogical seminars were established in the Prussian universities. These requirements, stringent though they were, were subsequently made even more rigorous. Plainly, the Prussians were determined to tolerate no charlatans among their secondary school teachers. In this matter of professional teacher-training, the Hohenzollern kingdom was ages ahead of the rest of the world.

---

[2] **The singular is *Gymnasium*. The g is hard.**

REACTION.—Napoleon, it will be recalled, was retired by his foes in 1815. The old order of things returned, and for a time the spirit of liberalism went into an eclipse. The chemise of political idealism was now discarded, and in its stead the nations pulled on the rougher shirt of bureaucracy. In this Prussia, if it knew the history of its monarchs, obviously needed no lessons. State control was now made tighter than ever. In education all liberal tendencies quickly succumbed to the pressure of reaction. In the universities, despite such gaudy traditions of *Lehr-* and *Lernfreiheit,* censors lurked in every crevice. Schools, serenely ignoring the actual needs of pupils, became roaring drill-machines, with the formal disciplinarians turning the crank. In 1848 the political liberals staged a revolution which unfortunately, however, ended in a smudge of inglorious failure. The screws of reaction were now given a few more tightening twists. Schoolmasters, in particular, it appears, had nurtured the pestilence of revolt—at least if we can hang credence on the virtiolic words poured on them by Frederick William IV at a Berlin teachers' conference in 1849. Said His Majesty:

---

[3] Greek was not absolutely required until 1824.

> You and you alone are to blame for all the misery which the last year has brought upon Prussia (*i.e.,* the Revolution of 1848). The irreligious pseudo-education of the masses is to be blamed for it, which you have been spreading under the name of true wisdom, and by which you have eradicated religious belief and loyalty from the hearts of my subjects and alienated their affection for my person. This sham education,

> strutting about like a peacock, has always been odious to me. I hated it already from the bottom of my soul before I came to the throne, and since my accession I have done everything I could to suppress it.

Plainly, this Frederick was no friend of the New Education. Lest his hearers might yet harbor any lingering rays of doubt, the king perorated, thus: "I mean to proceed on this path, without taking heed of anyone, and indeed, no power on earth shall divert me from it." A joke? Not at all. Wittingly at least, this monarch was no humorist. He meant precisely what he said, and for the ensuing years progress in education hadn't a ghost of a chance. Even such a harmless being as the kindergarten, as I have already noted, was held suspect and clapped under the interdict.

THE PERIOD OF NATIONALISM.—The tide of reaction couldn't, of course, stay at flood height forever. Even in the sixties signs of recession were manifest. But it wasn't until after 1870, after the launching of the German Empire, that education was once more seriously inspected and overhauled. Thus in 1872 there was put into the statute-books a law which, beside reaffirming the gospel of state control in education, gave the elementary schools a new course of study. Instruction in religion, curiously enough, was "put in the center of the teacher's work." But even in this domain the state was to do the pontificating, and not the church.

The secondary schools, too, came in for some tinkering. As early as 1859 those *Realschulen* that offered a nine-year course, including Latin, were given official recognition as secondary schools on a par with the highfalutin *Gymnasien.* The most significant changes, however, didn't arrive until the last decade of the century. Meanwhile, as I have stated elsewhere, the jousting between the old and the newer disciplines had been launched in the pedagogical stadium. Thus the gymnasia, with their program of classics and formal discipline, were being assailed on all sides by those who bawled for a place for science and the new culture. In 1890, interestingly enough, the recent William II threw his potent influence on the side of the modernists. Disguised, like some of his illustrious ancestors, as a pedagogical authority, the Emperor in a characteristically lengthy harangue, put his imperial quietus on the whole argument. "Whoever," he said among many other things, "has been in the *Gymnasium* himself and has caught a glimpse behind the scenes knows what is lacking there. Above all, the national basis is lacking. We must take the German as the foundation for the *Gymnasium;* we ought to educate national young Germans and not young Greeks and Romans . . . ." This, the Kaiser contended, classically enough, was "the *punctum saliens.*" In 1901 all barriers were lifted, and graduates of the three existing secondary schools, *i.e.*, the *Gymnasium, Realgymnasium,* and *Oberrealschule* were admitted to the university on an equal basis.

PREWAR ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.—Given in what the Germans call the *Volksschule,* public elementary education in 1914 was universal, free, and compulsory. With minor variations, the compulsory period was usually eight years, beginning in the main when the child was six and ending when he was fourteen. The school year usually lasted from forty to forty-two weeks with a weekly program of from twenty to twenty-two hours in the lower grades and about thirty hours in the upper grades. The usual fundamental subjects were taught, and instruction therein was thorough and efficient. This, combined with the rigid and ineffable enforcement of compulsory education, virtually made illiteracy a nonentity.[4] Scrupulous care was bestowed upon the child's health and physical growth. Indeed, school medicoes were connected with most first-rate schools, though their work was not always on a full-time basis. Gymnastics held an important place in the curriculum. So, too, religion. In the latter subject a minimal four hours a week were required in most schools.

---

[4] Illiteracy before the war was put at .05%.

In addition there was instruction in drawing, nature study, and singing. In the more up-to-date schools boys usually got some training in manual work, while girls were made privy to the mysteries of domestic science, with special stress on cooking. In the main the sexes were taught separately, coeducation being held suspect. The teaching was done chiefly by men, who, as I have hinted, were magnificently trained. Discipline was stiff, and if necessary pedagogues were permitted to lay on the rattan.

Not all German youngsters attended the public *Volksschule.* Some, for example, went to the *Vorschule,* a three-year institute which prepared its students for the secondary school. Like most European lands, Germany had no educational ladder. Graduates of the *Volksschule* could not, under ordinary conditions, enter the secondary school. Some students, to sidestep this obstacle, went to the *Volksschule* for three years, and then at the age of nine, switched over to the secondary school. There was also a species of schools known to their customers as the *Mittelschulen.* These charged a fee, and in return offered a nine- or ten-year course. with a foreign language in the last three years.

PREWAR SECONDARY EDUCATION.—Designed for the mental as well as the social *haut monde,* the secondary schools of the vanished Empire were of several kinds—depending in essence on the length and nature of the courses given. At bottom, there were three main types of secondary schools based on a nine-year course of study. To these belonged the celebrated *Gymnasium* which stressed Latin and Greek; the *Realgymnasium* with Latin but no Greek; and the *Oberrealschule* with neither Latin nor Greek. There were also the *Progymnasium, Realprogymnasium,* and the *Realschule.* The latter three were simply schools giving the first six years of the regular and corresponding nine-year academies. Completion of six years of secondary school work entitled one to a one-year term of voluntary military service. Those unfortunates who didn't make the grade, like the masses who came from the *Volksschule,* did a two-year military stretch for the Fatherland.

Secondary education usually started when the boy turned nine. His preparation, as I have explained, was generally not in the *Volksschule,* but in the private, three-year preparatory *Vorschule.* Curricula rather than organization, discipline, and methods were the chief differences among the various secondary schools. The stronghold of the classics was the *Gymnasium,* while the *Oberrealschule* represented the citadel of science. The *Realgymnasium* was somewhat of a halfway compromise between the old and new culture with a lean-ing, I suspect, to the latter. Religion, drawing, physical training, and some singing were required in all three types of secondary schools. No discreet person, I daresay, will accuse the German secondary school of any lack of curricular pabulum. True, the school may have been without hordes of activities sacred to the American high school pedagogue. Thus it was without organized athletics, clubs, service squads, and the rafts of extra-curricular operations that bulge high schools throughout the Republic. But these gauds the Germans frankly didn't care to hang on their houses of learning. Schools were not amusement parks, but places designed for study. In such a *milieu* scholarship and discipline naturally were in esteem.

When a boy turned nine and was to go in for secondary education, he had to decide for one of the three types of schooling. Once the die had been cast, there could seldom be a re-crossing of the academic Rubicon. Thus, a lad entering the *Oberrealschule* could not later transfer to the *Gymnasium* since Latin began in the very first year in the latter academy. Nor could he go from the *Realgymnasium* to the *Gymnasium* after his third year since he would have had no Greek. To blast away these hardships, a new type of school known as the *Reformschule* was created at Altona in 1878. Of this, various hybrids sprang up, the Frankfort type probably being the most hardy. Briefly, the reformed type of secondary school aimed to delay as long as possible the pupil's necessity of making a choice. This it strived to do by combining several types of learning under one roof, and grounding the whole outfit on a common foundation. There was, thus, a common basis for the great triumvirate of secondary school types. The reform idea was particularly attractive to the smaller communities whom it enabled to establish one fairly large secondary school with a variety of courses. If increasing numbers mean anything, then by 1914 these new-type schools may be accepted as a success.

PREWAR SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR GIRLS.—Secondary education for girls is a nineteenth-century creation. It wasn't until 1872 that Prussia began to give some heed to the problem with the establishment of a ten-year course which an ambitious young lady entered at the age of six. Extended and improved in 1894, the courses offered to girls were virtually put on a par with those given at the boys' schools. In 1908 Prussia once more reorganized the whole business. Again a ten-year course was set up. As before, the beginning age was six. The first three years were preparatory. The ten-year school was denominated the *Lyzeum.* Beyond it was the *Oberlyzeum.* Divided into two courses, this harbored the *Frauenschule* and the *Höheres Lehrerinnenseminar.* The former bestowed upon its students a two-year general course including household arts, kindergartnering, needlework, languages, civics, economics, music, and art. The *Lehrerinnenseminar* was more formidable. It offered a four-year course for nascent elementary school teachers. Those young women who wanted a secondary school discipline equivalent to that given the boys, switched at the age of thirteen to the *Studienanstalt.* Here the three types of education offered at the *Gymnasium, Realgymnasium,* and *Oberrealschule* were on tap. Girls weren't asked to undertake the study of Latin until they were thirteen. And Greek was shoved off for another two years. But French came at the age of nine, and English at twelve. At bottom the girls' secondary education was much more flexible than that of the boys. As in the case of the latter's secondary schooling, however, tuition in the girls' secondary schools was not free.

Some Other Prewar Schools.—One of the striking features of German education before the war was the relatively high enrollment of students in the continuation schools. In origin these schools trek back to the eighteenth century. In those remote days, however, these schools served as supplements to the regular elementary schools. Conducted on Sundays, they were voluntary, and were intended in the main to bolster the knowledge plucked from the lower school. One of the first significant ordinances dealing with this particular brand of education is located in the *Gewerbeordnung.* Flung down in 1869, it stipulated among other things that employers were "to grant the necessary time to all their employés, under eighteen years of age, who may be subject to attendance at a local or state continuation school." Instruction, furthermore, was to be dispensed "only at such hours on Sunday as will not interfere with the main church services . . . ." And also:

> Compulsory attendance at continuation school may be established by an ordinance of the community or local guild, for boys under eighteen years of age and for girls under the same age if engaged in commercial pursuits.

Subsequently the features of these 1869 regulations found their way into the laws of the Empire. In time, as German industry began to walk with both legs, the *Fortbildungsschule,* as the Germans call their continuation school, began, like the army and Wagnerian opera, to grow into an important organ of the national *Kultur.* By 1914, either through state legislation or through local by-laws, compulsory attendance at continuation school was virtually an accomplished fact, though of course there was no such thing as national uniformity in this particular territory of education. Bavaria, for example, required four years' attendance, while more lenient Württemberg was satisfied with only two. Even the courses of study varied in a vast way. Traditionally, as I have said, the curriculum was merely an intensive repetition of that of the elementary school. For the most potent and splendiferous scheme of continuation schools the ribbon of honor, I suspect, must be hung on Munich. Here under the capable direction of Kerschensteiner, one of Germany's great latter-day pedagogues, a program of continuation education was brewed amid the co-operation of employer, teacher, students, and others. The student's occupation became the center about which the general subjects were grouped. Did the youngster earn his shilling as a barber? Then give him three hours of practical work, some elementary surgery and trade knowledge, in addition to the usual and general prescription of religion, composition, arithmetic, bookkeeping, and civics. Was he a tailor? Then supply him with a knowledge of his trade, and let him for good measure become cognizant of technical drawing, wares and materials, gymnastics, plus the general prescription. There were three classes of continuation schools, namely, industrial, commercial, and general. The industrial academies catered to machinists, butchers, barbers, woodworkers, printers, and others. The commercial schools were organized in such groups as food and provisions; drapery and textiles; banking, insurance, and bookselling; porcelain, cutlery, and hardware. Dr. Kerschensteiner, for a long time the pedagogical potentate of Munich, is known to most of the better-read American pedagogues for his stress on training in citizenship. Well trained and efficient *Staatsbürger* are his educational goal. The general subject of civics, hence, was important. It included among other things such items as personal and occupational hygiene, economic and industrial history, and civics proper.

Beside the regular continuation schools, Germany of course had most of the special schools found in the rest of the world. Industrial, vocational, technical, commercial—all the familiar brands were present.

THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION OF 1919.—Devoting an entire part to education, the Weimar constitution of August 11, 1919, proceeded to lay the foundation of a new, reformed German system of education. Fundamentally, the general principle embodied in the new constitution's educational clauses is that art and science and the teaching thereof are free and guaranteed the state's protection. Public school teachers are state officers with the rights, duties, and privileges of the same. School supervision is to be in the hands of lay and professional schoolmen. Education is compulsory for at least eight years, and is to be followed by attendance at the continuation school. A common, four-year foundation school (*Grundschule*) is established, and attendance is compulsory for all children. The *Vorschulen* are to be abolished. Public moneys may be voted by the various states and localities to assist poor parents in sending their children through the middle and higher schools. Civics and manual training are to be incorporated as standard equipment of the school curricula. To be set as the goal of education in all schools is "a moral education, a sense of responsibility to the state, individual and professional efficiency in the spirit of German nationality and of international reconciliation."[5] Religion, as in the imperial era, is considered a part of the school curriculum. But it is no longer a required subject. Communities, interestingly enough, are given local option in the matter of religious education. They have the constitutional right to establish schools according to the paricular religious creeds of the school patrons.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION.—The Socialists, who right after the revolution were in the legislative saddle, true to their credo, wasted no sympathy on religious instruction, and would, if they could have had their way, have hurled out such instruction completely and permanently. On the other hand, however, were to be considered the interests of the batallions of denominations who felt that without religious instruction the schools would be no better than a revival of the reign of Nero. Considerable heat was generated by both factions, and while the constitution was being framed the air was full of complicated and indignant syllogisms. In the end the usual results were produced. The religious-educational clauses which finally emerged from the legislative debating dens took to an obvious middle path. They were, in brief, the usual compromise which pleases none of the combattants, but which they all begrudgingly—and temporarily, they hope—accept. Viewed from the religious standpoint, there are three types of elementary schools, to wit: interdenominational, sectarian, and secular. The first of these is the celebrated *Simultanschule.* Here all denominations are present. The lay subjects are taught without regard to creed. But when the bell rings for the religious lesson, each pupil goes for instruction in the wisdom of his particular denomination. And this instruction, moreover, is handed down by a subscriber to the particular faith being taught. On the surface the

---

[5] German Constitution, Section 148.

Simultanschule has a broad and tolerant mien. Unfortunately, however, the school is assailed on all sides, and for many reasons. Thus the Socialists hold it suspect for the simple fact that it isn't secularized *in toto.* The clergy denounce it because it doesn't teach the lay subjects from the denominational point of view. There have been several attempts on the part of the reverend men of God to have the constitution amended and come out flatly for the sectarian school. The matter of lay professional school supervision has also stirred the ire of the theological worthies, and in this domain they have been working with zest to regain some of their lost power. Thus far, however, on all fronts the situation remains on the whole unchanged. The German law-givers have stood by their guns, though how long they can hold out, is, I suspect, quite another story.

SOME CONTEMPORARY SCHOOLS.—All German youngsters must, as I have said, for their first four years of schooling attend the *Grundschule.* This at bottom is an attempt at democratization—somewhat dubious perhaps, but not without innumerable friends. It is hailed by some as the beginnings of a common school for all. Naturally enough, parents are not lacking who roar against the idea of compulsory public education for their children. But the *Grundschule,* I am compelled to report, is a *fait accompli.* The constitution, it will be recalled, demands at least eight years of elementary schooling for each youngster. The pupil, thus, may go on for another four years, completing with his *Grundschule* foundation the regular elementary *Volksschule.* Or he may cast his lot with the *Mittelschule.* This he enters directly after his exitus from the *Grundschule.* The middle school is a six-year institute, and offers its students an opportuity to transfer to a secondary school on the basis of an examination. The great trinity of secondary schools still exists as before the war. In addition, two other types have been developed. These are the *Aufbauschule* and the *Deutsche Oberschule.* The former is a six-year establishment intended for pupils who have completed a seven-year course in the *Volksschule.* It is a device which enables pupils to stay in the elementary school almost up to the very end, and yet pluck the blessings of a secondary education, and thus get ready for the university. The *Deutsche Oberschule* sprang into being during the war. Its main emphasis is on the social sciences and on the native language and *Kultur.*

Higher Education.—German universities in the main are state institutions, supported chiefly by the state, and controlled by the decrees of the Minister of Education. Fees are charged, though as usual these are not inordinately high. Traditionally, the university is composed of the four faculties—theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. The latter embraces most of the newer subjects such as language, science, literature, and sociology. Some universities have graced themselves with a special faculty in the natural sciences. Munich boasts of a faculty in political science. Cologne and Frankfurt have a special faculty in sociological science. Giessen, Munich, and Leipzig have a faculty in the veterinarian lore. Internally the university is administered by a university senate, made up of representatives of the several faculties. The official head of the university is the rector. He gets his high office not from a board of trustees, but from the votes of the full professors, and the approval of the Minister of Education. The rector is appointed for one year. Two words are always connected with the German higher learning—*Lernfreiheit* and *Lehrfreiheit.* Briefly, the former means the right of election, to study according to one's own plan and purpose, without outside coercion. *Lehrfreiheit* signifies academic freedom. Beside the universities, the German higher learning includes technical higher schools, industrial higher schools, schools of agriculture, forestry, and so on. Of all German education the higher learning, as might be expected, has been the least touched by the war.

Chapter Eight

FRANCE

THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY.—Up to the Revolution of 1789 French education was mainly in the hands of the clergy. Not that the idea of secular control had escaped notice. The eminent Rousseau, it will be recalled, had stirred plenty of Frenchmen with the warm ideas he presented on the subject in his *Emile*. Voltaire, ever ready to take a fling at the holy clerks, was an indefatigable battler for state control. And so in the main were the reigning men of the intellect who graced that turbulent era. Before the Revolution finally burst over the land, however, the question remained in the realm of metaphysics, and as far as practical results could show this meant precisely nothing. But once the Revolution got in its gashes the controversy plunged from the interstellar space of theory to the hard but solid ground. Thus for a time the Revolutionists dived into a wild carousal of secularization. The old and discreet respect for the *clericus* vanished, and in its stead there was a growing suspect of anything that had an ecclesiastical smack. As a result much of the clerical puissance slid down the chute. This was the time when the church schools were confiscated, and hence also when the foundations of a secularized system of education were set in place. But for a time such a system was only an unplucked wish. True, the legislative mills of the Revolution ground out law after law on the subject, but like so many legislative enactments of the day, they were in the main fantastic and hence unenforceable. With the notable exceptions of the Normal School and the Polytechnic School at Paris not much was effected.

THE NAPOLEONIC INFLUENCE.—It is to Napoleon that credit goes for launching the organization of French education. Starting in 1800, he transformed the hoary and moss-covered humanistic *Collège Louis le Grand* (*né* 1567), and out of its endowment summoned up four military colleges—which, I daresay, he needed. Subsequently in a less bellicose frame of mind, he converted one of this military quartet into a School of Arts and Trades. In 1802 through the celebrated Concordat the diminutive Corsican made his ecclesiastical peace with the Holy Father. This brought the priests back to their basilicas, and in addition virtually entrusted primary education to their guidance and control. A year latter the Brothers of the Christian Schools, a holy teaching sodality that had been frightened out of its educational operations by the bellowing French Revolutionists, were recalled. Before long the Brothers were more firmly established in education than ever. In the same year that Napoleon ceased open hostilities with Holy Mother Church there was turned out from his legislative halls what is known as the Law of 1802. Divided under nine heads, the edict of 1802 blew its legal breath over the entire educational outfit. Thus it deals with degrees of instruction, primary schools, secondary schools, special schools, military schools, general regulations, and so on. The measure stipulated among other things that each commune was to furnish a schoolhouse and a home for the schoolmaster. Instruction was to be limited to the three R's. Lest teachers got over-ambitious janissaries of the state, curiously enough, were called upon to watch that the pedagogues "did not carry their instruction beyond these limits." Education was not yet on the free-list, though about one-fifth of the pupils were taught without charge. To the support of the primary school the state, however, contributed nothing.

Napoleon, as is well known, shed little concern over the schooling of the masses. What caught his interest in education had to do mainly with secondary, higher, and technical training. If the Law of 1802 left the primary school out in the cold, then it was certainly more courtly toward the secondary houses of the intellect. Thus through its sober stipulations it set up two types of secondary schools, the *lycée* and the *collège*. The former was national, and offered to its students a very potent academic meal, made up of the ancient languages, rhetoric, logic, ethics, literature, mathematics, and physical science. In addition a provision was thrown in for extra instruction in the modern tongues and in drawing. Established by the municipality, or sometimes even by an ambitious individual, the *collège* was a local and not a national school. Its pedagogues dispensed instruction in Latin, the mother tongue, history, geography, and mathematics. Neither of these academies was free; yet, as usual, scolarships were available. Two years after the enactment of the Law of 1802 France was adorned with some 750 secondary schools of varying hues and dimensions.

In 1808 Napoleon, now lifted to the purple, brought into being the University of France. Like its transatlantic relation, the University of the State of New York, this University of France wasn't a teaching university at all. In brief, it was simply a bit of educational machinery, designed to regulate education in the whole Empire. True to the Napoleonic spirit, centralization was its working tempo. Curiously enough, this centralized system remained unchanged long after Napoleon's final descent. Indeed, as late of 1875 it was still pounding on its antiquated cylinders.

Reaction Under Louis XVIII.—After Napoleon had at last passed away under a cloud, France graced itself once more with a monarchy. The first king to take the throne was Louis XVIII (1815-24). In his reign, alas, no vast and heroic educational triumphs announce themselves. The era was drowned in reaction, and hence, I suspect, educational progress at best could only move with a limp. True, the state did fling open its vaults, but the gold it extracted therefrom for the benefit of the primary schools was never a fabulous amount. These schools continued in the main under the spell of the Christian Brothers. Indeed, in 1818 things were made even more comfortable for the holy brethren when the state undertook to grant them teaching licenses without the troublesome formality of an examination. To get a license henceforth the candidate simply presented a letter of obedience from the head of his order. Clerical potence got still another boost when the cantonal school committees were remodeled so as to give the clergy absolute control of the Catholic primary schools.

Progress under Louis-Philippe.—Louis' successor was Charles X, who in a moment of rare forgetfulness tried to suppress the constitutional rights of Frenchmen. They reciprocated, as is well known, with a revolution which, though it was only of brief duration, turned out the absent-minded monarch. The next to take his turn on the French throne was Louis-Philippe. Fortune caressed him, it appears, for he ruled for eighteen years, and was stopped only by another revolution. It was during the early days of his reign, moreover, that some important renovations were undertaken in the sphere of elementary education. Thus during the very first year of the new king's sway a grant of a million francs a year was dropped in the lap of the primary schools. Next (1831) came a resounding thwack at the reverend wearers of the cloth. For one thing, they were shorn of their high powers on the cantonal school committees; and for another thing, the right of exemption on the part of the religious brethern from the examinations for teaching licenses was rescinded. And finally, to make an end, there were established (1830-31) some thirty normal schools.

The next step in this French parade to public education was the dispatching of Victor Cousin, an eminent and leading educator, on a scouting expedition to the German lands. This was in 1831. Cousin did his job admirably and with thoroughness. In a lengthy report he poured eulogies on German education. The school laws of Prussia he saluted as "the most progressive and perfect legislative measure regarding primary education" that he had yet encountered. So strongly did this law move him that he felt convinced that "a law concerning primary education is indispensable in France."

THE LAW OF 1833.—Cousin's report struck a significant chord in French education. On the basis of it, despite all sorts of obstacles that lurked in the way, the French enacted the educational Law of 1833 which at bottom is the cornerstone of modern French education. Briefly, this measure put into being a system of elementary schools of two levels—primary and higher primary. The former was to be established in every commune, but the latter was expected to be on hand only in the larger communes. Tuition fees, curiously enough, were still demanded, but children of the poor were to be exempt therefrom. In the primary schools the usual 3 R's were to be dispensed, and in addition there was to be instruction in morals and religion. On this elemental instruction that of the higher primary school was to be grounded. Here the main offerings were in geometry, surveying, drawing, natural history, the physical sciences, history, geography, and music. Plainly, the state was determined to make education available to the majority of its burghers. And equally plainly, it was bent on doing the job itself. With this in mind it reserved for itself the important right of licensing and appointing its teachers.

Up to the Third Republic.—In 1848, as I have hinted, the French with the help of another revolution brought the reign of Louis-Philippe to an inglorious close. Once more in its quick and easy way the land slipped into the republican frock. This time Louis Napoleon clambered into the presidential seat. His rule, down to his final exit in 1870, a forlorn and saddened monarch, was one of relentless decay. Like his great uncle, he turned himself into an emperor. But unlike his great uncle, I am inclined to believe, he was at heart a mountebank. To intelligent and liberal ideas he was certainly not *sympatico,* and hence the lists of the banned grew inordinately long. Not only were many of France's educational lights exiled into the outland, but many of those who remained were suspect and hence closely watched. Like most of the crowned conservatives, Napoleon III made concessions to the clergy. Through his benevolent encouragement the religious schools almost doubled in number. Private schools—and these of course tended to be denominational—were given inordinate freedom to compete with the state schools. Educational budgets were scrutinized and cut. The pay of primary teachers was decreased. The courses in the normal schools were chopped down. State education, to sum it all up, had gone into a pathetic decline.

FRANCE

EDUCATIONAL REFORMS OF THE THIRD REPUBLIC.—After Napoleon's downfall and the Franco-Prussian fiasco, France concentrated on the job of clearing away the debris. During the first decade of its existence, the Third Republic overhauled and renovated the French schools. Education now became a national business, and to make it function and thrive, millions of francs were dispensed. It was not until 1881, however, that primary instruction was at last made free. With this a fact, the route was now open to make it compulsory. This came in 1882 when obligatory attendance between the ages of six and thirteen was legalized. A much more difficult undertaking, however, was the matter of school secularization. Here progress was slow but steady. Thus in 1881 all teachers were required to have a state license. Five years later members of the clergy were forbidden to teach in the public schools. The heaviest blow fell in 1904 when the teaching congregations were suppressed. Thus nearly a century after the French Revolution, France in its educational scheme had at last succumbed to the revolutionary ideals of a free, compulsory, and secularized system of schooling.

ORGANIZATION OF FRENCH EDUCATION.—One of the most salient features of the French school system is its centralization. At the top of the Republic's educational machinery is the Minister of Public Instruction and Fine Arts, who is appointed by the President. As a minister, the appointee is a member of the reigning parliamentary cabinet, and may, when the mood strikes him, appear in either of the two houses of legislation. His powers are relatively vast. In the legislative bullring he initiates educational enactments. A good part of his time goes to the preparation and presentation of the educational budget. He may, like most ministers, issue decrees and regulations. To act as his advisers, he may appoint a cabinet of officials; and obviously, if he feels so inclined, he may also cashier them. Oddly enough, by the grace of French law the minister must personally sign all official correspondence of the ministry. Since most modern French cabinets are here today and gone tomorrow, the Minister's stay in office is indefinite. Attached to the ministry, however, is a permanent staff. This is split into four main divisions, thus: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Higher Education, and Finance. In addition there is a body which sheds its attention on the problems of physical education. This is under an inspector general, who, however, plucks the help of a special advisory committee on physical education.

To keep cognizant of the development of educational opinion throughout the realm, and also, I suspect, to counterbalance the load of bureaucracy, there is a Higher Council of Public Instruction. This is composed of professional educators representing every educational branch, except the technical, from the elementary school to the university. Most of the members of this Council get their post by being elected thereto by their own representative group. A few, however, come into office through their appointment by the President. The Council meets twice a year. Its chief function is to give advice on such matters as courses of study, textbooks, examinations, marking systems, administrative and disciplinary regulations, supervision of private schools, and so on. Plainly, the committee's operations are not light. Like most advice, that dispensed by the committee is not necessarily followed.

Still another advisory corps associated with the ministry is the Consultative Committee. This is made up of three sections—elementary, secondary, and higher. Its chief reason for being is to make recommendations for appointments and promotions, and to render advice on questions submitted to it either by the Minister or by its own permanent committee.

Finally there is a staff of twelve general inspectors, four of whom are women. Composed in the main of experienced pedagogues and inspectors, this staff serves as a fount of educational information. Its members, who are denizens of Paris, are assigned by the Minister to make annual tours of inspection, and make reports on conditions at the educational front. Among other things, the staff supervises the field inspectors.

Thus the main, central scheme of French educational administration. Its chief feature, beside its long and imponderable array of structural parts, is, I believe, that in the main it is manned by experts. Each of these fellows, moreover, has a clear and definite function. And all of them are more or less under the control of the Minister.

Beside the organization thus far limned there is yet more machinery. Thus there are seventeen academies, each of which is in its way a duplicate of the national organization. Sixteen of these academies are graced with the presence of a university. At the head of the academy is the rector, who gets his job through the President. The rector is theoretically responsible for all branches of education within his domain. Actually, however, he concentrates on the universties, and on the secondary and normal schools. In his academic division the rector is the direct representative of the ministry. The rector, too, is not bereft of advice. To supply this there has been created an Academic Council, consisting of dignitaries from the university, secondary and normal schools, as well as the departmental, and communal councils. As might be expected, there are the usual sqadrons of inspectors. Of these there are over a hundred. They are appointed and, when necessary, removed by the Minister. Briefly, the inspectors are responsible for the smooth functioning of the educational machine. Some of the matters on which they pour their powers are such things as the enforcement of the educational laws, the opening and closing of schools, the granting of certificates, teachers' conferences, the appointment of probationery teachers, and so on. An academy inspector must be of the first chop, and the qualifications range from experience as primary inspector to that of a university professor. The primary inspector, whom I have just mentioned, is appointed by the Minister on the basis of a competitive examination. To be eligible for the position, the candidate must have had at least five years' teaching experience. Once appointed, the primary inspector finds himself responsible to the rector, the Minister, the general inspectors, and the academy inspectors. True to his name, the primary inspector operates in the elementary school. Some of the duties which fall on his shoulders are such matters as school attendance, disciplinary problems, recommending the appointment or dismissal of teachers, inspecting public and private schools, approving time-schedules, and so on. Plainly, the primary inspector is a busy man.

Below the academies there are still further educational divisions—the departments, communes, and cantons. The departments, ninety in number, range in size from 1300 to about 4000 square miles. Their official head is the prefect. A political appointee, the prefect gets his post through the grace of the Minister of the Interior. Educationally, the prefect functions as the head of the elementary school system of his department. One of his chief powers is the appointment of teachers of permanent tenure. Like the minister and the rector, the prefect is assisted in his work by a council. The communes vary in size from a few dismal acres to the city of Marseilles with a populace of more than a half-a-million head. Its nearest American counterpart is the township. The educational chief in the commune is the mayor. Assisted in his educational role by what is known as the communal council, the mayor chiefly contributes to education in the encouragement of school attendance, the maintenance of a school census, and the oversight of school property.

Elementary Education.—When the child becomes six, and thus reaches the age of compulsory attendance, it is confronted by four educational options. [1] In the first place it may decide to enter no school at all. In this case it remains at home for its instruction. Known as the *enseignement à la maison* (instruction at home), this practice attracts in the main only those homes with a lavish supply of money. Moreover, to insure a satisfactory standard of work under this instruction-at-home plan, the French law requires that every child thus educated must undergo an annual examination in those subjects taught to pupils of similar age in the public school. Children who are not tutored at home attend the regular public elementary school, or if their parents so decide, they may go to a private school. Such an academy, as I have hinted, is usually a citadel of some religious sect. The fourth highroad open to the child is the preparatory departments of the *lycée* or *collège*. This is a direct route for the secondary school.

The public primary school is divided into three sections—preparatory, intermediate, and advanced.

---

[1] Before entering upon a regular form of elementary education, the French child, like the youngsters of most civilized lands, may attend the *école maternelle* (mother's school) or the *classes enfantines,* both of which correspond to the kindergarten. The former, interestly enough, is one of the early types of infant school. Founded by Jean Oberlin, a kindly and altruistic man of God, it was brought to Paris in the early nineteenth century, and subsequently made a part of the national school system.

Extending to the child's ninth year, the first of these teaches the usual and well known elementary subjects, and in addition tosses off some instruction in morals. Contrary to the educational practice in prewar Germany, religion is not taught in the French public school. In the intermediate course the youngster is usually held up to his eleventh year. Here advanced instruction in the work taken on the lower level is bestowed upon him. For good measure, moreover, he is made cognizant of the inscrutable workings of the physical sciences, manual training, plus some horticulture and agriculture. The last step is the advanced course, and here, as might be expected, the training is more concentrated and hence more potent than in the lower levels. On the distant sky-rim examinations leading to the elementary certificate now loom, and a good deal of study during the advanced course hinges on the coming quizzes.

ADVANCED PRIMARY SCHOOLS.—Higher than the established elementary schools, but ranking below the secondary schools, are the complementary courses and the so-called advanced primary schools. These fling open their doors to students who have snared the elementary certificate, and who, moreover, can successfully withstand a competitive examination. Forming a natural continuation of the elementary school, these advanced primary schools usually receive their pupils at the age of thirteen. The average course comprises a period of three years. Usually the first year is devoted to general instruction while the remaining brace of years is consecrated to some sort of specialized work. Special sections are given over to normal, industrial, and commercial training.

Secondary Schools.—Secondary education in France is offered, as I have duly noted, in two types of schools—the national *lycée* and the communal *collège*. Both institutes have boarders, and both charge fees. There are, however, numerous competitive scholarships for free places all through the secondary classes. Very likely the most popular of all French schools, the *collège* and *lycée,* have both exerted a potent influence on the French *Kultur.* The high esteem in which these citadels of learning are held is due, I suspect, in part at least to the magnificent scholarship they breed—a scholarship which in France is still in good standing. Originally the stronghold of the classics, these academies have always tended to lean to their original ideals. Naturally enough, their courses of study have perforce been modified to make room for the newer disciplines, but in their cloistered halls a scent of tradition hangs in the air.

Before the war the regular secondary course started with the child's tenth year and continued for seven years. There were two cycles, divided into four and three years respectively. In the first of these there were two main curricula—classical and scientific. In the former Latin was a compulsory subject from the outset. Greek was made optional at the beginning of the third year. In the scientific course, as might be expected, neither Latin nor Greek was taught, more time being given to the mother tongue and the sciences. The second cycle usually started when the pupil turned fifteen. No matter what he had studied during the first cycle, he could, when he entered this second stage, choose any one of four curricula. These varied from the arch-classical type with Latin and Greek as their hallmark, to the modern-language, scientific species of the academic fauna. At the end of the first cycle a student took the first part of his baccalaureate examination. This was a state inquisition. The second installment was due at the end of the second cycle. If the student came through these quizzes, which to say the least were remarkably searching, he was awarded his baccalaureate, which after so much labor the student no doubt prized. Its main practical value was that it opened the gates to the higher learning.

As in most other civilized lands, secondary education for girls in France is of rather recent birth. Up to 1880 young ladies who desired more than elementary education were generally directed to the private schools. In 1880, however, the French law-givers enacted a measure which established *lycées* and *collèges* for women. The courses on tap, however, were not for seven years as with the boys, but only for five years. Nor was the curriculum graced with the classics. The mathematics and science, moreover, which these institutes offered were of an elementary nature. On the other hand, however, the girls were given ample opportunity to display their high talents in domestic economy, hygiene, drawing, and music. Today girls' secondary education has been lifted to a higher sphere. Thus a French *demoiselle* may, if she feels so inclined, study for the baccalaureate. In the smaller towns, not blessed with a special *collège* for the girls, the young ladies are allowed to attend the boys' *collège*. Such, however, is only an emergency measure, and not usually acceptable as a sane pedagogical practice to the average French scholastic.

POSTWAR EDUCATION.—In essence French education hasn't undertaken any vast or startling changes since the late war. And this, I am inclined to contend, is natural and inevitable. The fact that the French Republic won the war—with some outside assistance—has tended to breed a spirit of national satisfaction. At the core, it is argued, the good, old French way of doing things has proved sound and reliable. The changes, hence, which France has launched in education haven't been of a very radical glow. Like the Germans, the French have come to suspect that their schools could well be inoculated with more of the juices of democracy. The demand that fees in the secondary schools be abolished is one phase of this trend. On the march there is also the movement for the so-called *école unique,* or common school. Still in its larval state, however, the *école unique* is thus far only a theory. What form it will take in practice, if it is ever thus solemnized, not even its supporters, I daresay, know precisely. In the matter of curriculum, French schoolmen have been striving to liberalize it from its bookishness. Physical training in particular has been coming in for considerable stress. As for the secondary schools, the sempiternal argument between the old and the new disciplines has been started afresh. In accordance with a regulation of 1923 lush concessesions were made to the classicists. All secondary school students were to have a common course of four years' Latin, two years' Greek and French, history, geography, one modern tongue, the natural sciences, mathematics, and drawing. With the close of the fourth year certain options were on hand. Thus there was a choice between a course which was downright classical with Latin mandatory and Greek optional, and a modern course with the usual second language, and thicker and heavier layers of the mother tongue. For the first six years the science course was to be the same for all students. Needless to say, these changes brought forth a hurricane of objection. The idea of making Latin and Greek compulsory for all in particular was corrosively denounced. A change in ministry saved the situation. Thus in the fall of 1924 by ministerial tinkering the first- and second-year classes of the scientific courses were re-established; the six weekly hours of Latin were dispersed by four hours of French, one of modern language, and one of natural science. In 1925 a new course of study was put out. This time the cycle of modern studies came back, and the idea of compulsory Latin and Greek was lugged out by the heels. During the first six years of the seven-year course about two-thirds of the time are consecrated to the French language and letters, history, geography, a modern language, mathematics, physical science, and natural science. These courses are required of students in both the classical and the modern sections. In addition the classical students take on six weekly hours of Latin during the first two years, five during the third year, and four during the next three years. Greek is attacked in the third year. In the fifth year, if the student wishes, he may substitute for the Greek a course in civilization and a modern tongue. The students in the modern section are made to pay for their exemption in the classics by being given extra work in French, history, geography, a modern language, and natural science. Their second language is launched in the fourth year, and foreign literature and civilization come in the fifth. When the students have withstood the first part of their baccalaureate quizz, they may choose either the philosophical or the mathematical class. Here again, however, they have certain subjects in common, to wit: history, geography, modern language, natural science, drawing, ethics, and logic. The philosophers, however, now also devote their minds to psychology, metaphysics, physics, and chemistry. If they also crave mathematics, they may select two weekly hours in that discipline. As might be expected, the mathematical class does its heavy cannonading in mathematics and the sciences. The question of the secondary school curriculum is still in the controversial state, and in the French halls of government the reigning Gallic Justinians continue to flog the air with their diatribes on this particular subject.

THE HIGHER LEARNING.—Historically, as is well known, the French higher learning dates back to the medieval age, when the first universities opened their doors for business. By the early nineteenth century, however, these cloisters of the intellect had become hoary and feeble. Napoleon, with his founding of the University of France, deprived the universities of their independence, and thus made them even shakier. Down to 1885 the French higher learning remained spiked and hamstrung. Then by law a few concessions were flung in their direction. They were allowed to hold property as a corporate body. They could organize a governing council. And they could co-ordinate their various courses. In 1896 a complete reorganization took place. Thus the name university was restored, and a university established in fifteen of the sixteen academies. [2] A full-blown French university has the four faculties of law, science, medicine, and letters. Not all houses of the higher learning, however, can boast of this academic quartet. But at all events, they have at least the main two, science and letters. French professors, it is perhaps of interest to note, are appointed to their chair by the Minister of Public Instruction upon the nomination of the faculty. Being a state employé, the professor draws his salary check from the state. French universities are open to both sexes. During the past few years French higher education has been caressed by an increasing enrollment. Foreign students, for various reasons, are being attracted to the French universities in larger and larger batallions every year. The medical and pharmaceutical lore seem to be the particular attraction. Paris in 1926 enrolled 25,123 students of whom 5,737 were foreigners. A year later the Paris roster had swollen to 26,108 souls of whom 7,215 hailed from the outlands.

---

[2] These are administrative districts. By the Napoleonic decree of 1808 which brought into being the University of France there were twenty-seven academies. Today there are seventeen academies.

Chapter Nine

ENGLAND

LATE DEVELOPMENT OF SECULARIZED EDUCATION.—Of the larger European nations, England was the last to embrace a secularized school system. Indeed, it wasn't until the nineteenth century that the Motherland began to make some crude and simple beginnings in this territory. And actually it wasn't until the twentieth century that the full and complete job was finally assembled. What are the causes of this strange and lamentable tardiness? They are, as the historical brethern have amply chronicled, quite simple at bottom. For one thing, the very idea of state education for the masses was in generally low repute. The learned dignitaries of Holy and Established Church, as might be expected, were dead against it. The well heeled and respected gentry weren't particularly interested in the matter. And if they toyed with the notion at all, they were generally inclined to delegate the educational office to the Church. The reigning hidalgoes who manned the House of Lords, then of course much more potent than its present dismal heir, worked on the principle that for the masses ignorance was indeed bliss. The king, even if he had been a forward-looker like his Hohenzollern competitors, could by himself do precisely nothing. Edicts and codes in England were the business not of royalty but of parliament. What was needed to convert England to the gospel of secularized mass education was obviously a change of the public heart. And such changes, as everyone knows, don't arrive over night.

This social transformation, however, was upon England at least by the start of the eighteenth century. For the development of English public education a significant fact, I believe, is that by this time the Anglo-Saxon realm had taken vast steps in the direction of social progress. Politically, the land was graced with ideas and practices so advanced in calibre that even the liberal Voltaire was amazed and charmed. Religiously, a tolerance of the first magnitude poured over the nation. Science and manufacturing were soaring to new heights, steadily and rapidly. At the century's halfway mark, the balmy, placid atmosphere of England was being touched on all side by complicated, social, economic, and political vapors. Meanwhile, as if to give zest to the whole matter, the daily newspaper had sprung into being. Then as now, these diurnal sheets pounded out the news from their laboring presses to mirror the passing show. Did all these heavings of the body social hang their mark on education? The answer, I take it, is obvious. Society had metamorphosed. The masses in particular were playing a stronger hand. They may as yet have drawn no aces, but at least they were in the game. That some of them should have been ambitious enough to crave literacy was, I suspect, a perfectly natural phenomenon.

THE CHARITY SCHOOL SYSTEM.—Not that the Anglo-Saxon *haute monde,* perceiving perchance a social *Götterdämmerung* in the offing, now changed their conservative minds and bawled for mass enlightenment. Such sudden and startling changes, the sociological savants relate, are not characteristic of the English temperament. There were, however, a few scattered altruists who held that the gates of education ought to be opened wider. Not satisfied with such feeble educational offerings as already existed, some of these forward-lookers, either individually or collectively, went to work to dispense education on a more liberal scale. By collections, donations, and foundations an organized system of charity schools was launched throughout the nation. Two of the more eminent workers in this field were the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (*né* 1699) and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (*né* 1701). The first spread its blessings on the home front, while the latter, true to its name, worked abroad. Both sodalities, as their illustrious title plainly shows, had a religious hue, and in their humble way served as shock troops for the Church of England. The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, or the S. P. C. A., as it came to be called, aimed above all things to convert its pupils into "loyal church members and to fit them for work in that station of life in which it hath pleased their Heavenly Father to place them." On their curricular *table d'hôte,* these charity schools served the three R's, some elemental hygiene, and the first principles of good behavior. In the latter department the reigning pedagogue was to be on guard for "the beginnings of vice, and particularly, lying, swearing, cursing, taking God's name in vain, and the prophanation of the Lord's Day, etc. . . . " Religious instruction was of course of the first import. Thus instruction in the "rules and principles of the Christian religion as professed and taught in the Church of England," were deemed the schoolmaster's "chief business." The schools, moreover, came to have a vocational mien. Boys were to be trained for "services or apprentices." Their more delicate sisters were to shed their talents on knitting and sewing. Beside broadcasting knowledge, the charity academies undertook to provide their needy pupils with adequate raiment. "Children," announced the regulations of one such school, "shall wear their caps, bands, cloaths, and other marks of distinction every day, whereby their trustees and benefactors may know them and see what their behavior is abroad." The S. P. C. A. worked with noble zeal. After fifty years of life, it had brought forth more than two thousand schools attended by fifty thousand children. Despite it all, however, the English upper world wasn't quite convinced. Education for the masses continued, like the dog in the law, a *hostis humanis generis.*

THE SUNDAY SCHOOLS.—In 1780 another noteworthy form of voluntary education came into being at Gloucester, under the direction of Robert Raikes, a local citizen and printer. This was the Sunday School. A kindly soul, with the juices of the uplift flowing in his medulla, Raikes on a tour into the slums of Gloucester, "was struck with concern at seeing a group of children, wretchedly ragged, at play in the streets." The condition, it appears, was particularly horrendous on the Sabbath when the local mills and factories were shut down. On such occasions, Raikes found, the children "are given up to follow their own inclinations without restraint, as their parents, totally abandoned themselves, have no idea of instilling into the minds of their children principles to which they themselves are entire strangers." Such, in brief, was the background of the Raikesian Sunday School. Bent on lifting these children out of their moral mud-holes, this Gloucester idealist gathered together some ninety of the town's youthful revelers. Out of his own funds he then hired four women to take his band of ninety in hand on the Sabbath, and to make them privy to "reading and the Church Catechism." His aim, in essence, was to convert these "little heathen of the neighborhood" into decent human beings. Excellent results oozed from his experiment. Five years after Raikes had started his Gloucester Sunday School, an organization was launched on a national scale to support and encourage Sunday Schools in every parish of the realm. By the end of the century the Sunday School had made a palpable hit. Raikes' Sunday School wasn't the first in the business. But this, I hold, is of no great import. Nor is the fact that as the years slipped by the Sunday School became an out-and-out church adjunct with no interest in teaching the lay subjects. The plain fact is that the Raikesian idea was magnificient ammunition for the *agents-provocateurs* who subsequently went on the prowl for parliamentary assistance in education.

LANCASTER AND BELL AND THEIR MONITORIAL SYSTEM.—In 1797 Dr. Andrew Bell (1753-1832), a *clericus* of the Established Church, put into print a small monograph wherein he described an experiment in the use of monitors as teachers. About a year later Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838), another man of God, this time of the Quaker rite, set up in the slums of London a school in which he applied a teaching method closely similar to the one previously announced by the Rev. Dr. Bell. Both gentlemen, curiously enough, had worked out their monitorial method independently. The followers of these two holy clerks, however, didn't always hold to this view. For a time, indeed, considerable heat was generated by the question as to who was the *Ur*-originator of the monitorial idea. Both men attracted followers in droves. In 1808, to boost the establishment of schools based on the Lancastrian formula, the Royal Lancastrian Institution was started. Subsequently this association became the illustrious British and Foreign School Society. Lancaster, as I have said, was a Quaker, and hence suspect to the more orthodox communicants of the Established Church. The fact, moreover, that he espoused such an outlandish doctrine as non-sectarianism in teaching didn't serve to make him any more popular with the Anglican devotees. Finally in 1811, to curb the apocryphal Lancaster, the Church of England tossed its ecclesiastical hat into the pedagogical ring by sponsoring the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church. The new organization was frankly sectarian, and held that "the national religion should be made the foundation of national education." Its first president was the Archbishop of Cantebury. Its chief pedagogical authority, needless to state, was not Lancaster but Bell.

THE MONITORIAL SYSTEM OF INSTRUCTION.—The monitorial system was thus christened because of its use of monitors. Older and, if possible, brighter pupils were picked and taught by the teacher. When each of these youngsters had absorbed his lesson, he was turned loose on a group of his own pupils. Each monitor usually handled a squad of ten such learners. With the monitorial ritual a teacher could direct the instruction of a vast collection of pupils. Indeed, the claim was made that a thousand learners could be taught at a single chop. Plainly, the monitorial system was wholesale education on an incredible and grandiose style. Hence it was also cheap. Lancaster put the annual cost of teaching a pupil in his school at $1.06, and Bell subsequently shaved even this low figure down to a dollar.

Organization was the keynote of the monitorial technique, and in this domain Lancaster was a whale. His *Manuals of Instruction,* containing directions for the organization and management of monitorial schools, would stir envy, I believe, in the most gifted and up-to-date efficiency engineer. Like all forms of organization, the monitorial system had a distinct mechanical smack.

> When a child was admitted a monitor assigned him his class; while he remained, a monitor taught him (with nine other pupils); when he was absent, one monitor ascertained the fact, and another found out the reason; a monitor examined him periodically, and, when he made progress, a monitor promoted him; a monitor ruled the writing paper; a monitor had charge of slates and books; and a monitor-general looked after all the other monitors. Every monitor wore a leather ticket, gilded and lettered, "Monitor of the First Class," "Reading Monitor of the Second Class," etc.

Thus reports Lancaster's biographer, Salmon. The pupils goose-stepped into class in military beat, and they left in the same precise way. They recited in unison and on command. They removed their hats on command. They showed their slates on command. School, in short, was actually a System.

INFLUENCE OF THE MONITORIAL SYSTEM.—Despite its mechanized grotesqueries the monitorial idea scattered much good. By its cheapness it put education on a purchaseable basis for almost everyone. This at bottom, I believe, contributed in a vast way to its success. The fact that the poor really craved an education could now no longer be logically denied. Incidentally, Lancaster with his non-sectarianism in education put quite a dent into the sectarian idea. The Established Church, it is true, strived very potently to put him down. In so doing, however, it was forced willy-nilly to take a larger interest in education. From the pedagogical standpoint, the system was obviously not a marvel. Repetition, routine, drill, mechanization, memorization, stress on quantity rather than quality were some of its main characteristics. Compared with the Pestalozzian technique then coming into its own, the monitorial ritual must be counted definitely out. But on the other hand, the monitorians threw considerable attention on the improvement of schoolrooms and apparatus. Lighting, ventilation, seating, noise elimination, and rafts of other details were carefully studied. They made considerable use of new educational material. Here I point to such things as writing desks, blackboards, and slates. Subject matter, moreover, was carefully scrutinized and graded for the purposes of class instruction. The idea of classifying pupils carefully and flexibly also engaged the monitorians. Finally, the movement clearly showed the need of training teachers, both for the new scheme and in general.

The monitorial system was bathed in considerable publicity, and soon the idea invaded the outland. Its cheapness, I daresay, must have made a strong appeal. Particularly was this the case in America. Numerous charity societies in the Republic employed the monitorial wisdom in their attempt to spread education among the poor. Subsequently, when the notion of a state system of education began to be taken seriously, even some of the state legislatures bestowed their favor on the monitorial scheme. For a time the pedagogic magic of Lancaster and Bell cast its spell into France, Belgium, Denmark, Holland, and on a small scale in some of the German states. In the latter, however, the monitorial idea couldn't stand up under the competition of the saner Pestalozzian pedagogics.

THE INFANT SCHOOL.—Philanthropy in education took still another form in the so-called infant school. Its chief apostle in the island kingdom was Robert Owen (1771-1858), a celebrated and opulent manufacturer. Like Pestalozzi, Owen had convinced himself that most of the ills on this ailing ball could be cured by education. To effect a cure, the main thing, as Owen saw it, was to put education to work while the youngster was still tender and plastic. Environment, Owen held, was the real tailor of man. With the right kind of training in the proper environs "infants of one class," he thought, "may readily be formed into men of another class." In 1816 at New Lanark, in Scotland, Owen undertook to hammer his lofty theories into actual fact. Here in the town where he operated his cotton mills Owen opened a school for children aged from three to seven. Children under six were to be taught "whatever might be supposed useful that they could understand." Moral instruction, as might be expected, was given a front place. Singing, dancing, and play were also on hand. The Owen school was particularly aimed at the low and dismal social conditions of the day whereby orphan and foundling asylums farmed out their five-, six-, and seven-year-old protégés as apprentices to manufacturers. Such indenture was usually for a nine-year term. The manufacturers, of course, tried to squeeze the most out of their bargain, and hence such apprentices had a sad time of it. Not only did these infant vassals sweat for nine years from twelve to thirteen hours a day, but when their term was finally up and they became free, they had at bottom learned almost nothing. With such foul business the advanced Owen had no sympathy. In his own mills employés under the age of ten were strictly banned. For them the Scot manufacturer put up schools.

The infant school prospered. Owen himself evolved into an amateur pedagogue, publishing monographs about his idea, and even traveling to Switzerland to inspect the doings of Pestalozzi and Fellenberg. Like all successes, the idea of the infant school soon spread.[1] Thus with the help of a small squad of English liberals an infant school was set up in London in 1818. This academy was manned by a former pedagogue of New Lanark. Subsequently (1836), under the guidance of Charles Mayo, the Home and Colonial Infant School Society burst upon the pedagogic scene. Its chief mission was to train infant school teachers, beside, of course, encouraging the founding of new infant acadamies. Mayo, having worked for a time at Yverdon, was a Pestalozzian, and through his efforts the strain of Pestalozzian principles was grafted on the infant school. From the Motherland the idea of the infant school came to America where, as usual, it prospered.

---

[1] Owen didn't invent the infant school idea, though he very likely evolved it by himself. Jean Oberlin's school for the young in France antedates the Owen contribution.

THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY.—With the exception of one legislative act, the parliamentary Hammurabis of eighteenth-century England fired off no other shots in education. The nineteenth century, however, was to be another story. During this era the protagonists of a national system of education were to lay down a relentless drumfire which, though painfully slow in getting the desired results, finally ended in 1870 in a glow of triumph. The first bit of law-making to open the combat came in 1802, and was known as the Factory Act. In brief, this stipulated among other things that apprentices weren't to labor for more than twelve hours a day, and furthermore that they were to be instructed in the three R's and religion. The act thus put down, however, was in the main unenforced. But for education it served a magnificient purpose in that it uncorked a steady and interminable flow of talk on the subject of the government's rights and powers in education. Some three decades after the creation of the Factory Act, parliament put through its mill a measure which provided an annual education grant of £20,000. This gold was to be distributed through the two leading educational associations, the National Society and the British and Foreign Society, and was to be used to aid in the building of schoolhouses. Both these leagues, it will be recalled, were of a religious hue, and hence despite parliamentary generosity, state education in 1833 was still cruising in interstellar space. Six years later parliament lifted its annual grant to £30,000. In addition it put into being a Committee of the Privy Council on Education. This creation has been chronicled as a step to state education, since it operated on the idea that if a school is to get money from the government, then that school ought to be open to the government's inspection. Though after 1840 the grants were state-controlled, yet they were still being distributed through educational sodalities. During the subsequent years parliament gradually increased the government's power over the schools. Thus it swelled its grants, extended them to school maintenance, and even made a part of the money available to Wesleyans and Roman Catholics. By the heavenly aid of state donations, moreover, beginnings were made in the development of training schools for teachers. In 1865 a State Department of Education was ushered in, but despite its noble name, this body was not particularly potent. Five years later the idea of "payment by results" was hatched. By this system the grant of parliamentary lucre to a given school was to be based on the results turned in by its pupils in the governmental examination. For the next three decades this principle of "payment by results" was to be the bedrock of state aid to English education. Pedagogically, this scheme had its flaws, since it put a premium not on sound principles of education, but on preposterous drillings and crammings for the state's quizzes.

THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1870.—In 1870 the halls of English legislation pounded out the celebrated Elementary Education Act. By this a national system was begun at last. Dividing the realm into school districts, this measure gave the various denominations a brief period wherein they might, with the usual governmental aid, set up schools. If thereafter accommodations didn't measure up to the government's standard, then the local burghers were to elect a school board. Empowered to levy local school taxes, this board was to maintain elementary schools. Such academies were christened board schools. The voluntary schools, as I have hinted, were still allowed to flourish. Indeed, they were to continue to be subsidized by governmental grants. Religious instruction was not forbidden, though in the board schools it was to be of a strictly non-sectarian brand. Despite the fact that the school boards were empowered to compel school attendance of all children between the ages of twelve and five, schools were not free. No provisions for compulsory attendance were made for those districts not blessed with a school board.

Such in brief was the much touted Education Act of 1870 which started England on the highroad to a national scheme of education. Its main defect among its many obvious merits was that the state still undertook to support the voluntary, denominational houses of learning. Competition between the board and voluntary type of education was inevitable. By 1895 the strain was beginning to tell on the latter. To save it, I suspect, from a dismal finish, the *Landsturm* of a conservative parliament in 1897 magnanimously handed it a special national-aid grant. But such an award, obviously enough, couldn't quite settle all grievances. What was needed was a general overhauling of the whole situation. This came in 1902.

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1902.—In 1902 education—elementary, secondary, and higher—was thrust under the control of one single local authority. [2] This included the voluntary as well as the board schools. The old school boards were dismantled, and their place taken by educational committees and councils. The matter of religious instruction was left to local option. The state's traditional policy of merely inspecting and assisting voluntary societies to maintain schools went down the chute. Henceforth, the state took over entire responsibility for the secular instruction of its people. Among other things, this act also stipulated that councils were to support instruction in subjects beyond the elementary grade. This, as might be expected, gave a magnificent lift to secondary education. The establishment of county secondary schools now began in earnest. The Education Act of 1902 had plenty of foes, but down to almost the end of the late war English education underwent no significant changes.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN 1914.—Before the war an English child might have started its elementary education by attending the infant school when he reached the age of five. Here he could stay until he turned eight, ruminating over the mysteries of the three R's and engaging in operations similar to those served up by the kindergarten. School attendance was compulsory throughout the realm for all youngsters under twelve. Local authorities could, if they felt thus inclined, raise the age limit to fourteen. Actual enforcement of compulsory attendance was anything but strict. Certainly it lacked the Prussian smack of efficiency. Concessions granted to the industrial lords had hatched the so-called half-time system, under which provision was made for partial exemption from school attendance after the age of eleven for children active in agriculture, and after the age of twelve for those engaged in industry. Another weakness in the attendance regulations—particularly from the viewpoint of economic and efficient school administration—was the fact that a pupil was allowed to quit school the moment he passed the compulsory age limit. Before the Act of 1902 was put to work, higher board schools had come into being in many of the larger cities. In the domain of secondary education these higher schools competed with the more exclusive "public" and "grammar" schools. However, at the turn of the last century the Court of Appeals flung down its celebrated "Cockerton Judgment," which banned the use of local taxes for instruction other than elementary. Whereupon the national board of education gave ample proof of its sagacity by grinding out a regulation which made fifteen the upper age limit for pupils in these "higher elementary" schools. Intended, obviously enough, for children between the ages of twelve and fifteen, these institutes were graced with the general curriculum, but in addition gave a few special blasts to the vocational subjects. At best, however, these academies were never important, and only attracted about two per cent of the eligible youngsters to their doors. Many children, after shedding their compulsory school age, migrated to an evening continuation school. In number, however, such schools were downright inadequate.

---

[2] Schools supported entirely by endowment were not thus included.

SECONDARY EDUCATION IN 1914.—Before the advent of the present century, there was, as I have hinted, practically no provision for secondary education for the offspring of the middle and laboring classes. There were, however, some distinct types of secondary schools. Topping the whole list, were the so-called public schools. Actually, as is well known, these weren't public at all, but private. Of these, the most celebrated were Winchester, Eton, St. Paul's, Shrewsbury, Westminster, Merchant Taylors', Rugby, Harrow, and Charterhouse. There were, of course, others. The English public school is of ancient vintage, Winchester, for example, made its arrival in 1384. Of the gallant nine just recorded, Charterhouse is the youngest, having been brought into life in 1612. In the main the public schools are boarding schools, though most of them also admit some day pupils. Since these institutions exact stiff tuition fees, they tend to draw their customers chiefly from the well heeled, upper classes. Curricularly, these schools are of the classical stripe, though of recent years some attention has been vouchsafed to mathematics, modern languages, and the sciences—or as the English student juicily refers to them, the *stinks*. Good form and courtly manners are what the public school strives for. Games and athletics come in for heavy stress.

Another secondary school for boys is the so-called grammar school, which also is of the endowed variety. It, too, is bewhiskered with age, and hence filled to the brim with tradition. The grammar school is a day school. It is cheaper and less exclusive than the highfalutin public school. Though these academies deal in the old disciplines of Latin and Greek, yet they serve up a much more varied curriculum than the public schools. Some of the grammar schools, in fact, have even installed very up-to-date courses in commerce and industry.

The Education Act of 1902, as I have already said, put upon the local authorities the duty of furnishing secondary education within their domain. As a result the county secondary school came into florescence. In their modest way, these new-type secondary schools catered to the masses. As might be expected, this school draws most of its pupils not from preparatory schools, but directly from the elementary school. These local secondary academies, interestingly enough, are in the main co-educational. [3]

THE FISHER ACT OF 1918.—On January 14, 1918, the English Minister of Education, Fisher by name, introduced in parliament a bill, which before the end of the year was to go down in the statute books as the Education Act of 1918. So sweeping were some of the stipulations of this measure that it immediately drew down perfumed hosannas from the whole world. The learned editors of the *New Republic,* for example, hailed it as "the beginning, and not the end of a social evolution without its parallel in European significance." Divided into five main parts, the Fisher Act completely reorganized the English educational system, putting it on a much firmer national basis.

---

[3] Beside the secondary schools set down there are the preparatory school and the private secondary schools, most of which, naturally enough, vary in purpose, curricula, quality of instruction, and so on.

Initiative on the part of local authorities, however, is generally invited. The act, interestingly enough, was summoned into being with "a view to the establishment of a national system of public education available to all persons capable of profiting thereby." It is the first of England's hordes of educational measures wherein public provision is not almost wholly restricted to the education of minors. The act strives to equalize opportunity for all youngsters regardless of social, economic, or religious status. In the phraseology of the Rt. Hon. J. Herbert Lewis, "it removes the poverty bar, and opens a highway for all classes right up to the university." Provision is made for the establishment of nursery schools for children under five. School attendance becomes compulsory at five and continues up to fourteen. Local authorities may then extend the term another year. Beyond fifteen, however, compulsory attendance is clapped under the ban. Attendance at a private school is not acceptable to the authorities unless such a school is open to inspection. A child may no longer quit school on the very day he becomes fourteen, but must continue to the end of the term. The routes to higher education are broadened. Not only is the number of scholarships increased, but the board of education also makes provision for the maintenance of needy students. Up to the age of eighteen, a youngster is made to attend continuation school—obviously an echo from Germany. However, for the first seven years of the operation of the new edict, at the discretion of the local authority, children are required to attend a continuation school only up to the age of sixteen. The responsibility for such education is thrust upon the local authorities. In lieu of attendance at the continuation academies, attendance at any other educational institution requiring high attendance is accepted. The half-time system is carried to the boneyard. Child labor up to the age of twelve, and partially up to fourteen, is abolished. The school medical system is radically extended, and is to include secondary and continuation schools, and such educational institutions as are provided by the local authorities. The duties and functions of the school medico now take on a much vaster import than ever. With the approval of the national board of education, local authorities are privileged to support or maintain camps, gymnasiums, playgrounds, open-air schools, gardens, baths, swimming pools, and so on. As might be gathered, special attention is given to hygiene. Provisions are made for the proper education of the physically and mentally defective. Concerning the matter of school inspection, all schools are required to furnish precise information about their organization, and any other particulars specified by the regulations of the board of education. Finally, it is perhaps of interest to note that the national authority agrees to dig into its own pocketbook to pay as much as one-half the cost of any project which in its opinion merits such monetary aid.

UP FROM THE FISHER ACT.—Though the Fisher Act made a palpable hit with idealists throughout the world, in its actual enforcement it soon struck a whole flock of snags. Gold, as everyone knows, wasn't too plentiful in postwar England, and without money it required nothing short of sorcery to put into actual being all the provisoes of the Fisher Act. The development of the nursery schools, for example, has been drastically curtailed. The compulsory day continuation schools, which, I am inclined to hold as one of the most significant creations of the whole Fisher Law, soon went down with a wasting disease. Today they are quite dead. In their stead voluntary continuation schools have arisen, and these, I am glad to note, are doing a fairly good business. Still, some advances must be chronicled. Half-time is no more. Whole or partial exemption from school attendance has virtually stopped. The child can no longer dash out of school the moment he passes beyond the compulsory age. All children must now attend school up to the age of fourteen. Recently, through the benediction and hard work of the Labor Party, the age limit was to be hoisted another notch, to the age of fifteen. Child labor, while still in furtive existence here and there, has none the less been put on its last legs. Gradually it is becoming obsolete. Hygienic and medical facilities have been extended on a grandiose scale. The English secondary schools, like the rest of their species throughout the world, report progress. Enrollments are steadily mounting. Likewise the number of "free places" in the secondary schools are climbing. "The position has now been reached," says an English pedagogue, "at which about one child in ten passes through a secondary school, and about one in twenty-five is educated there entirely at the cost of the public." [4]

THE ENGLISH HIGHER LEARNING.—Up to almost the end of the last century higher education in England was the monopoly of such ancient seats of the intellect as Cambridge and Oxford. This couple, as is well known, dripped with conservatism. Slowly, however, the vast pressure of the modern era has begun to make itself felt. Not that these two halls of learning have gone the dreadful way of some of their American counterparts and instituted courses in bee-keeping, golf, and tap dancing. More discreet and sober, Oxford and

---

[4] *Educational Yearbook,* 1928, p. 16

Cambridge have metamorphosed in statelier ways. Both schools have now opened their gates of learning to women. In addition to the older academic degrees, Oxford is now also offering the Ph. D. Both universities have suffered economically since the recent war to end war, and have even found it expedient to accept financial help from the state treasury. During the past few decades several muncipal universities have burst upon the scene. These, since they have no traditions dragging them down, are much more modernistic in their general academic tone. Men and women are admitted on equal terms. The chief strongholds of these newer schools are at Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, and Bristol. In 1901 the University of London was converted from an examining body into a full-fledged teaching university. Made up of a federation of schools and colleges, this university boasts of eight faculties. As in most other lands, postwar university enrollments in England have been on the rise.

Chapter Ten

THE UNITED STATES

THE RELIGIOUS MOTIVE.—Most of the early boatloads of colonists who let themselves down on American soil as permanent settlers were moved, as is well known, by religious motives. Persecuted in the homeland for their apocryphal dealings with God, batallions of these godly people braved the heavings of the Atlantic to snare religious freedom in America. A number of them even came intact, as congregations, and transported their pastors with them. Wherever they finally settled, and whatever government they chose to regulate their affairs, living in the faith and perpetuating it became the *leitmotif* of their unadorned colonial life. Whatever education prevailed in those high days necessarily had a deep religious smack. Training the young for church membership, and keeping the land well supplied with learned men of God were the main functions of education.

THE PURITANS.—Of all the Old World emigrés who made for colonial America, the New England Puritans, I am inclined to believe, left the heaviest mark on American education. The first flock of Puritans landed on the celebrated Plymouth Rock in 1620. Settling down along the New England littoral, these early Puritans, reinforced by fresh arrivals from Europe, almost at once set up an imitation of Calvin's theocratic city-state at Geneva. In this, it will be recalled, church and state were partners, but in the main the former was a majority stockholder and hence was able to impose its will upon the latter. In New England this sacerdotal state in time emerged as the well known New England town. A colonial federation with a General Court wherein each town held representation loosely combined the whole outfit.

Early Interest in Education.—Education with these primal Puritans was a serious matter. As in the Motherland, home instruction flourished. Children were made cognizant of Holy Writ. They were drilled relentlessly in the family prayers. And finally, they were initiated into the mysteries of congregational worship. By 1647 the town elementary school made its appearance. In the main it was simply a nursery of orthodoxy. Several towns undertook to adorn themselves with a grammar school. The illustrious Boston Latin School, for example, hung out its shingle in 1635, and has continued existent ever since. A year after the establishment of this Boston intellectual atelier, the first American college burst upon the scene. This was Harvard. Founded for religious reasons, Harvard aimed to keep the land stocked with learned and efficient pastors who were to man the churches "when our present ministers shall lie in the dust." Theology, as might be expected, was Harvard's most potent gun. In all this educational activity, just as in the homeland, the schools were in the hands of the clergy.

THE MASSACHUSETTS LAW OF 1642.—New England, despite the watchful eye of the clerical *gens d'armes,* was not, I suspect, without its backsliders. Somewhere in the farflung stretches of the Puritan satrapy, there must have been an occasional anti-Puritan. Certainly in the realm of learning, some negligence, as always, was on tap. Snared by the earthly and voluptuous marvels of the New World, some parents, forgetting their duities to God and country, began to neglect the training of their young. In like manner masters had become forgetful of the Christian needs of their apprentices. To put the quietus on all this, the church turned to the state for help. The result was the famous Massachusetts Law of 1642. By this manifesto, the town's chosen men were among other things to "take account from time to time of all the parents and of their children concerning their calling and employment of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of this country." Fines were plastered on such criminals who "shall refuse to render such accounts." In the historical tomes this bit of lawmaking has gone down as the first statute in an English-speaking domain to order that children should be taught how to read.

THE LAW OF 1647.—The act of 1642 did not, however, establish schools to teach the art of reading. Hence those anti-Puritans who didn't mind paying a fine now and then could still bring up their brood in unchristian darkness. After five years, however, with the enactment of the Massachusetts Law of 1647, this sad situation came to an end. The law was a deliberate thrust at Old Horny and his dogs of Hell, "It being," as the enactment clearly stated, "the one chief project of the old deluder Satan to keep men from a knowledge of the Scriptures." To stop these low doings, the law ordained the establishment of elementary schools in towns of fifty families. Towns graced with a hundred families were in addition to bedeck themselves with a Latin grammar school "to fit youths for the university." The law had teeth, and for failure to fulfill its benevolent stipulations a town was penalized £5. Subsequently this was raised to £20.

Though in all this legislation, the state continued to play second fiddle to the church, some far-reaching and significant principles for public education were none the less put down. First, there was intoned the idea that for a state's welfare universal education is requisite. Next, there was the notion that the state may compel parents to supply such education to their youngsters. Finally, there was the important doctrine that public moneys, raised by general taxation, may be used to supply such state and universal education.

THE DECLINE OF NEW ENGLAND EDUCATION.—By the halfway post of the seventeenth century, however, the New England learning was beginning to show unmistakable signs of decay. Many causes were at work. For one thing, the exodus from the mainland had come almost to a dead stop, and thus the New Englanders were running low in first-rate and zealous men of learning. For another thing, the early religious zest had calmed down considerably, and hence the stress on training for orthodoxy had begun somewhat to wane. More potent than either of these two causes, however, was the increased scattering of the population. A populace which had originally banded around a meeting-house now began to reach out into remoter distances. The town school, hence, became increasingly unreachable. To supplant these houses of learning the so-called moving school was invented. At bottom this was simply a teacher who roved from place to place, setting up his pedogagical booth in each, and remaining there a couple of months or so during the year to dispense his magic. The moving school finally became the district school, and with the installation of this, education in New England hit the bottom. The moving school had been graced at least with a fairly competent birchman who taught throughout the whole year. But the district school in the main had no such charms. Its pedagogues were barely paid, and hence wallowed in incompetence. They taught for only a few months of the year.

EDUCATION IN THE MIDDLE COLONIES.—In the middle colonies religion also played a heavy educational role. Unlike New England, however, the middle colonies harbored a much more varied denominational assortment. Dutch Reformed, Lutherans, Quakers, Mennonities, Baptists, Presbyterians, and many others stalked through the midlands. Most of these Christian devotees were convinced that the route to Heaven was paved with the ability to read Holy Writ, and hence all of them favored an elementary education. At the outset such education took the guise of a parish school directly harnessed to the church. The Dutch burghers of the New Netherlands set up their parochical schools. Girls as well as boys attended these early academies. Beside the three Dutch R's, a formidable dose of religion was served to the pupils.

The officiating schoolman was at times a combined pedagogue and sexton. Thus, beside ramming wisdom into the heads of his young disciples, he was often expected to keep the church clean, to provide the necesary implements for holy baptism, to ring the church bell, to dig graves, and to send out funeral invitations. Despite this dreadful array of duties, most Dutch teachers in some inscrutable way managed to turn in a fairly satisfactory teaching job. In the New Netherlands education flourished, but with the arrival of the English, it started down the slide. Education now became voluntary, and was put either on a fee or on a charitable basis, under private or church control. The school system of the middle states is usually referred to as the church type, in contrast to that of the New Englanders who had a state type. Pennsylvania, like the New Netherlands, employed the parochial school system. Likewise New Jersey and Delaware.

EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA.—In the southland education was not very different from that of England. The scheme that prevailed in Virginia is typical, and is usually known as the selective or *laissez-faire* type of education. Settled not by heretical dissenters, but by devotees of the established Anglican rite, Virginia lacked the religious incentive in its education. Agriculture became the leading occupation and this, since land was plentiful, was done on a large scale. Hence the phenomenon of an immense congeries of towns such as bedecked New England was absent. Concentrated community action in education, as a result, was loaded with difficulty. Nor was the population as homogeneous as in early New England. The upper and lower social strata were sharply differentiated. The gentry who owned the lands naturally had different educational leanings from the masses who did the heavy toiling. As usual, these differences put their stamp on education. Thus, like their aristocratic brethern in England, the Virginia *haut monde* resorted to private tutors for their heirs. Sometimes, when conditions were right, they even sent their children to the Old Country for an education. For the masses education was mainly industrial and dispensed through a system of apprenticeship. Secondary education was a purely private venture, attracting no particular interest either from the state or from the church. As might be expected, such secondary education was classical. In 1692 William and Mary, the first college in Virginia, was established. Not until 1705 did Virginia begin to approach the idea of compulsory education, and then at its best it was adulterated. Referring to the instruction of apprentices, it required that "the master of the orphan (apprentice) shall be obliged to teach him to read and write."

THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD.—FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE EDUCATIONAL REVIVAL.—Like all wars, the Revolution was not without its corrupting influences on education. In the midst of the combat, naturally enough, learning had to take a back seat. But even when the fight was over, and the Republic ushered into *de facto* existence, educational affairs were still in a low state. At best, the new nation shambled with an unsteady gait, and the most important problem that faced the Founding Fathers was to put the country firmly on its two legs. Was commerce a nonetity? Were the states bickering among themselves? Was the nation plunged in debt, the times hard, its citzenry out of work? Plainly, there were hordes of problems that demanded the right of way over education. Progress in education at best was *andante.* Tremendous bowlders lay in the highroad to public education.

PUBLIC MONEY TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS.—First, there was the practice, typically English, of bestowing public moneys upon private schools. In New England this gave nurture to the academies. These were private, run by corporations, and reserved for the well-to-do. Since the New England *noblesse* wanted a secondary schooling for its offspring, the academies very handsomely met a need. Since, also, the wealthier burghers wielded considerable influence, it wasn't altogether so unnatural that in time they should have been able to convince their law-givers that academies should be subsidized by public moneys. Once the scheme was put into practice, it flourished. By 1840 Massachusetts was bedizened with half-a-hundred such subsidized private secondary schools.

In New York City the grant system took another tack. Here in 1805 through a band of altruists there was created the Free School Society. Its mission, in brief, was to establish schools for those youngsters who attended neither the church nor the existent private schools. From its inception, this sodality was kissed by prosperity, sharing in the state school fund and receiving grants of gold from the municipal government. In 1826 the Free School Society got a new charter from the state whereby it was authorized to rechristen itself as the Public School Society, beside demanding a fee for instructing the heirs and assigns of those who could afford such an outlay. School attendance promptly slid down. After a few years the system was discarded, and the doors to education opened to all without charge. In 1828 the state Justinians authorized a local tax to help the Society to carry on. Though the Public School Society did magnificent work, it was not without its foes. The various denominations in particular were inclined to look askance at the Society's operations. The lush monetary pickings which had fallen to the brethern of Public School Society naturally tended to stir hopes and longings in the denominational breast. And hence the City Council was repeatedly drowned with demands from the various sects that they too be given a share in the public school funds. Playing as safe as possible, the City Council politely but firmly put the damper on such propositions. As time slipped by, the jousting between the Society and its foes took on more heat. Finally, the Roman Catholics treked to the state halls of legislation to search for justice. Did the Public School Society live up to its non-sectarian principles? Was its teaching of non-denominational mien? It was, contended the indignant Catholics, nothing of the sort. What the Society was teaching through its preceptors in its schools was unadulterated Protestantism, and no more non-sectarian than the Council of Augsburg. To put an end to these denominational feuds, the legislature finally established a board of education for New York City. This was in 1842. It was to be elected by the people, and its high mission was to administer and guard the use of the school funds. Then and there the doctrine was established, in theory at least, that public moneys may not be employed for sectarian purposes.

SECTARIANISM.—To the development of a genuine secularized system of public education, sectarianism in itself was an obstacle of Doric heft. In New York it took the shape of a financial brawl. In Pennsylvania and other states there were still other angles to the problem. Though plenty of reformers roamed up and down the Pennsylvanian stretches and bawled for public education, the ancient feeling that such wasn't the business of the state continued to persist. Each denomination—and there was a goodly and varied number—continued to look upon the schools as cradles of orthodoxy. Without the usual denominational stampings a school was unthinkable. The best that the reformers could do was to get a measure through the legislature (1802) which subsidized private schools, paying them with public funds for the instruction of those children whose parents were too impoverished to pay themselves. Through the efforts of the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Public Schools, a law was finally flung into the statutory books in 1834 permitting boroughs and townships to organize themselves into school districts, and to levy school taxes for common schools. To get even this concession had taken a battle of seven years. And even then there was still considerable ruction, particularly in the eastern sector of Pennsylvania, where over half of the school districts in the whole state voted against such taxation, or simply took no action at all.

Other Obstacles to Public Education.—Beside the sectarian opposition to public education, there was a general feeling, especially on the part of the poor, that free education was pauper relief. South of the Potomac, in Virginia for example, the idea of public education had long and rigorously been espoused by Thomas Jefferson. Giant that he was, Jefferson saw in the public school a way to first-rate citizenship. Through his influence in 1796 a measure was put through which permitted communities to establish public schools and to support them by local taxation. But this in itself was purely a local drop in the educational bucket, and hence without much general effect. Certainly it wasn't near the advanced Jeffersonian ideas on public education which in extent, I daresay, took in the entire hog. In 1810, however, a lustier step was taken when the Virginia legislators created a "literary fund" for the support of public education. This fund in time bulged considerably with gold. Out of it, in fact, stepped the University of Virginia—another of the gifted Jefferson's ideas. For the instruction of the poor, however, some $45,000 was appropriated. "Poor schools," as such houses of edification were labeled, were organized for the instruction of the masses. Such schools, I submit, were perhaps better than none at all, but at best they were inadequate. The paupers themselves held them suspect. Hordes of poor people, refusing to stamp themselves as paupers, wouldn't have anything to do with such academies. The pauper school was a magnificent marker of class differences.

The first shell of any force to burst upon the pauper-school idea was fired in Pennsylvania from the guns of the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of the Public School. It resulted, as I have already pointed out, in the Free School Law of 1834. This, however, was impotent in that it was optional, and hence not well enforced. Actually the fight against the pauper school wasn't over until 1873, when the last Pennsylvania district finally accepted public education. In New Jersey the campaign centering around the poor school was likewise heated, and the air shook with considerable argument. The first law to come from the combat appeared in 1829. By it the state undertook, among other things, to distribute $20,000 to help establish a system of district schools. The mandate, however, was feeble and falsetto, and the next year it was pitched out, and the poor schools welcomed back with a cheer. In 1838, partly as a result of Pennsylvania's attack on the pauper-school notion, the New Jersey law-framers set up a partial public school system. Finally in 1844, with the adoption of a new state constitution, it was stipulated that only public schools were to bathe in the support of the state school fund.

With the finish of the poor schools in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, their career in the North was over. In the West the poor schools never had a chance. In the South they lingered longer than anywhere else.

MOVEMENTS FAVORABLE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—If the development of public education was swathed in enormous handicaps, then it was also under the influence of some helpful balms. For one thing, there was the celebrated Ordinance of 1789, in accordance with whose benevolent clauses, Section 16 of the thirty-six sections into which each town was sliced was reserved for the support of public schools. By a subsequent measure two or three whole townships were set apart for the support of a state university. This was the start of federal aid to education. It was also an important and imposing *Vorspiel* in the development of public education.

A very potent push to general education came from the monitorial system which had been imported from the homeland. Its cheapness, as I have set forth elsewhere, [1] was one of its main lures. Not only did it attract American scholastics in large numbers, but subsequently when the idea of state appropriations for education began to be merchanted about, the monitorial magic attracted numerous legislators. The illustrious Governor De Witt Clinton of New York confessed that he saw "in Lancaster [2] the benefactor of the human race." The monitorial system, moreover, was "a blessing sent down from heaven." Aside from this somewhat dubious divine origin, the monitorial system served the cause of public education in a high and magnificent way. In America, as in England, the scheme extracted considerable discussion on the whole question of public education. By gradually getting the American populace used to the idea of paying the bills involved in free education, the monitorial drill sheds gave the nascent public schools an immense and unforgettable lift. Finally, again as in the Motherland, the monitorians clearly demonstrated the importance of adequate and decent teacher training, and hence did their bit for the development of the American normal school.

---

[1] *Cf. pp.* 179

In 1816 the English version of the infant school arrived in the American Republic. Its port of debarkation was Boston. And since the conditions for its rise were excellent, the infant-school idea quickly zoomed off to a large and flourishing success. Primarily, the idea reached the heights, because it was an adequate answer to a large and growing need. For in those palmy days, curiously enough, the free schools that actually existed weren't usually open to beginners. In the city of Boston, for example, youngsters who couldn't read or write were barred from the lower school. Enlightenment in the fundamentals, it was strangely presumed, was the business not of the public elementary school, but of the home—or if not the home, then at least the private school. Two years after the infant-school doctrine had sailed into the Republic, the city of Boston, through its municipal fathers, tossed off its official salute in the form of an appropriation of $5,000. With this sum of gold the infant school was to be made a part of the city's public school system. Such infant academies were now to be denominated primary schools, and were to admit the rising Bostonian at the age of four. They were, oddly enough, to be open throughout the whole year, and were to be staffed by women. The function of these primary schools was to prepare the youngsters for admission to the regular lower school, which by this time had been graced with the name of grammar school. The Bostonian example was widely imitated, and after a few decades had elapsed primary schools were blooming in most of the civilized states.

---

[2] Lancaster, as I have noted elsewhere, was one of the developers of the monitorial system.

Beside helping to develop the American primary school, the infant school also turned in some new ideas in the teaching method. The school had arrived in America when the early fires of enthusiasm set off by the monitorial necromancers were already beginning to abate. This process of dephlogistication the infant schools now stimulated. Thus, for one thing, they taught small groups and thereby pleased the pedagogical pundits who were denouncing the wholesale methods of the monitorial pedagogues. Furthermore—and this I am inclined to consider even more significant—the infant schools flirted with the Pestalozzian technique, and introduced it into some of their strongholds. This, as is obvious, gave new life to the teaching process.

Beside exporting the infant school to America, England also dispatched the Raikesian Sunday school.[3] At the start the American Sunday school was of a non-sectarian order. Its main purpose, as in England, was to lift the poor out of their ignorance and save them from the clutches of vice and ruin. In 1786 a Raikesian Sunday school opened its doors for pupils in Hanover County, Virginia. A year later South Carolina matched the Virginia contribution with one of its own. This was a Sunday school for African offspring. The Sunday-school idea moved ahead steadily and rapidly, and before long its lyceums flooded the whole land. In time, as nearly everyone knows, the Sunday school shed its non-denominational feathers and became a standard equipment of most churches. As such, however, the Sunday school no longer trafficked in the lay subjects. For these disciplines it substituted religious instruction. The Sunday school's heaviest effect on the subsequent development of public education flows from the fact that it caused a fairly large portion of the American populace to throw its thoughts on the need of free and secular education for all.

---

[3] *Cf.* 176

OTHER FOREIGN INFLUENCES.—In addition to being stimulated by the Anglo-Saxons, the development of the American public school system was of course influenced by other lands. The French Revolutionists, for example, heaved off many an eloquent ode to the glories of free, state education, and though they themselves didn't quite succeed in dragging in the educational millennium, yet many of their ideas on the subject were caught by some of the world's more lustrous thinkers. In America, as I have already explained, one of the more estimable of such advocates of free, secular education was Thomas Jefferson. Of much grander proportions than the French influence, I daresay, was that of Prussia and some of the other German states. In Prussia the arch-type of modern, state education held sway. When other lands began to flirt with the idea of secular education, they quite naturally shifted their glances in the direction of the German domain. France, as I have already announced, actually dispatched its investigator Cousin [4] to take note of the German educational high spots. Some of the American states in less direct ways did likewise. From 1820 to 1840 numerous unofficial monographs on German schemes of state education were flung into print in America.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL REVIVAL.—In the annals of educational history the years 1840 to 1876 have been put down as the Public School Revival. More romantic historians sometimes like to label the period as The Awakening. During this era the various influences that I have limned flowed together. For a spell they effected no small furor. But out of their effervescing syrups there finally oozed the American public school system. This in essence was to be free, universal, and compulsory for all. Beside the influences already noted as contributory to the growth of public education, naturally enough, there were others. Social changes in particular got in some heavy shots. Cities burst upon the American scene. Transportation and communication emerged from the larval state. Industry arose. With it came the laboring class, escorted by its usual handmaiden of class consciousness. All sorts of strange demands began to fill the air, and these, curiously enough, issued not only from the forward-lookers with bulging I. Q.'s, but also from the representatives of the masses. One of these demands which became increasingly *fortissimo* as the years passed on was the call fot free and universal education.

---

[4] *Cf. p.* 153

Horace Mann.—Glued to the public-school-revival epoch is the name of Horace Mann (1796-1859). Born in the Massachusetts hinterland in the town of Franklin, Mann was the offspring of unadulterated Calvinian stock. His parents, like those of most self-made Americans, were poor. Consequently the lad got little learning beyond that on tap in the local district school. A certain Dr. Franklin, however, had adorned Mann's birth-town with a library, and here young Horace spent many of his scattered, spare moments. While still a lad, he lent his ears to the politico-theological bulls of Dr. Emmons, the local Calvinian representative of the Lord. But even in those early days the juices of individualism must have been secretly brewing in Mann's hidden recesses. For one day he unceremoniously tossed away his Calvinian beliefs, and decided henceforth to do his own pontificating. At the age of twenty, Mann set himself down to a six months' training campaign to get himself ready for college. In 1896 he was admitted as a sophomore to Brown University. He easily stood out from the rest of his mates, and by stepping on the gas of his intellect he was able to romp off with the highest honors in his class. As a tribute to his academic lustre, he was picked as the official haranguer of his graduating colleagues. His parting blast was learned and lifting. Its title was "The Gradual Advancement of the Human Species in Dignity and Happiness," a theme which many savants now offer as evidence of Mann's early interest in his fellows. For a brace of years the graduate Mann served *Alma Mater* as a combined librarian and tutor, specializing in the classics. Like most pedagogues, he plucked plenty of excellent experience but very little hard cash.

Finally Mann switched to the law. He put on the flowing robes of the advocate in 1823, and continued in the profession in an active way for fourteen years. Like most rising barristers, he was eventually sucked into politics. In 1827 he garnered himself a post as state representative. To this legislative seat he was re-elected year after year, until in 1833 the voters thrust him into the Massachusetts senate. Four years later he was bedecked with the presidency of that illustrious body, and while thus active he signed the bill which created a state board of education for the Commonwealth. His signature to this bill, interestingly enough, was to be the swansong of his juristic career. For as fate and Massachusetts' politics would have it, Mann was converted into the secretary of the newly established board. "The bar," he now confessed to one of his friends, "is no longer my forum. . . . I have betaken myself to the larger sphere of mind and morals."

For the next twelve years Mann was to labor in this larger sphere. To it he brought an assortment of traits which, as the years rolled on, were to serve him well. Characterized by discreet and liberal views, by vast initiative and a magnificent pugnacity, as well as an administrative talent of the first slice, Mann was plainly the right fellow for a difficult job.

Briefly, his task as secretary to the board was to study the decadent Massachusetts school system and to suggest improvements thereto. Mann jumped into his work with zest. First he put his glass over the district school, and here of course it wasn't very difficult to detect dreadful and outlandish conditions. On these he reported at length. To stir the citizenry out of their complacence, Mann roved through the length and breadth of the

Commonwealth, organizing conventions and public meetings, and flinging off roaring philippics on the subject of school reform. These educational crusades he bolstered with his writings in the *Common School Journal* and in his notable Annual Reports. From his capable pen streamed the whole dismal, educational gallery—sectarianism, incompetent pedagogues, obsolete equipment, inadequate supervision, decadent schoolhouses, and so on down the line to lack of standards and uniformity. Mann's criticisms were plain and understandable. As usual, they brought down upon him a cloudburst of denunciation. Did he dare to oppose instruction in creed and dogma in the public houses of learning? Then obviously it was because he was Satan's advocate. Did he expose the hands of his office-holding foes, and denounce these fellows as sordid politicians? Then it was because he was a public enemy who should be thrust into the nearest bastille. The schoolmasters of Boston, he hinted, were ignorant. And their supervisors he put down as sleepy. When the Boston birchmen objected, and came out with their "Remarks upon the Seventh Report of Mr. Mann," the vigorous secretary came back with a "Reply to the Remarks." When they tried to shut him off with "A Rejoinder," Mann gave them both barrels with his "Answer to the Rejoinder to the Reply to the Remarks on the

Seventh Report." Plainly, such a relentless fellow was nobody's easy victim. His obscurant opponents he gulped down with the same ineffable ease and joy of a peasant dispatching a gallon of applejack. In the end Mann chalked up victories on all fronts. Slowly public opinion swung to his side, and when Mann finally checked out of the secretariat, education in Massachusetts had undergone a strange and remarkable transformation.

Well, what were some of the things he brought about? First, I am inclined to point to the matter of school appropriations. In Mann's regime these almost doubled. Two millions were put up to get better school buildings. Teachers were made happy with substantial rises in salary. In return the pedagogues were expected, however, to give better service. To help them, three public normal schools were put into being in various sectors of the Commonwealth. A full month was added to the school year. Supervision was lifted to a real and significant plane. Public high schools increased and gradually edged the private academy into the educational background. Textbooks were overhauled and made better; teaching methods were improved; discipline was mellowed and civilized; school libraries were summoned into being. In short, in his twelve secretarial years, Mann operated on the whole educational corpus, converting it from a feeble and tottering nonentity, into a magnificent, secular and public system that was a live and going concern.

In 1849, run down in health by the continuous onslaught of his adversaries as well as the vast demands of his office, Mann relinquished his post. For a time he sat in Congress as the follower of John Quincy Adams. Subsequently, however, Mann re-entered the pedagogical arena, this time as president of Antioch College. His main work in education, however, was already embalmed in history. In 1859 he made his final retreat.

HENRY BARNARD.—If Mann performed in a grand and heroic way as an educational revivalist, then his high doings were well matched by those of the illustrious Henry Barnard (1811-1900). Born at Hartford, Connecticut, Barnard was the heir of a cultured family. At the tender age of fifteen Barnard put up at Yale. Here, like Mann at Brown, Barnard glowed with high intellectual incandescence. The work at Yale was over in four years, and Barnard now dedicated himself to the law. In 1835, however, he suspended his legal doings, and assumed instead an interest in education. This was the time when he sailed over the Atlantic to become acquainted at first hand with the schools of Europe. On his return to the Republic he entered the political bullring, and succeeded in snaring an election to the Connecticut shrines of legislation.

Here in 1838 he introduced a measure which aimed to establish in Connecticut a board of education similar to that of the neighboring Commonwealth. The bill became law, and Barnard, like Mann across the border, became the board's first secretary. For his toil he was to receive the stupendous honorarium of three dollars a day plus his traveling expenses. Like Mann, again, Barnard now went on the prowl for better education. He organized public meetings, delivered addresses, and flung off learned monographs. Unlike the potent Mann, however, Barnard was not so formidable a political gladiator. As a result, in 1842 the Connecticut law-givers abolished the board of education and repealed the educational laws, and hence put Barnard out of his job.

If Barnard lacked Mann's fiery pugnacity, then at least he possessed a resourcefulness of the first magnitude. Turned out of office in Connecticut, he was called to Rhode Island to investigate and report on the educational operations of that state. Subsequently Barnard displayed his findings in an address to the Rhode Island legislators in joint session. For his efforts he was graced (1845) with the first Rhode Island commissionership of education. His work was splendid and of a high order. Thus he got increased school appropriations; broadcast hordes of educational tracts;

developed teacher-training institutes; organized a traveling model and demonstrational school; and established libraries of at least half-a-thousand tomes in almost every town. All these high deeds must have stirred Connecticut bile. By 1851 the state was quite ready to repent, and Barnard came back, this time to become principal of a brand new normal school and, *ex officio,* secretary of the rebuilt Connecticut board of education. In his new capacity Barnard served to 1855, continuing his civilizing work, until a breakdown in health forced him to relinquish his job.

In the same year that he turned his back on his Connecticut office, Barnard summoned into existence the American Association for the Advancement of Education. Garbed with the Association's first presidency, Barnard plunged into the colossal task of editing and publishing the *American Journal of Education,* an organ of pedagogical edification, which on this side of the Atlantic is still, I believe, without peer. Styled "the most encyclopedic work on education in any tongue," the *Journal* ran into thirty-one fat volumes, each of which is a vast and splendidferous fount of pedagogical information. In its pages are embalmed the arcana of nineteenth century education. Virtually every significant, educational reform to be introduced in America up to 1880 owes a good part of its florescence to the support of the *Journal.*

While thus busy in the editorial sanctum, Barnard once more turned his talents to educational practice. For a time he served as president of the University of Wisconsin from which he migrated to St. John's College in Maryland Free State. In 1867 he was transformed into the first United States Commissioner of Education. Before he passed on to his celestial bliss, an advanced and heavily bearded octogenarian, Barnard had the high satisfaction of seeing most of the reforms for which he had drawn his rapier set up in actual being. On the historical scrolls Barnard is listed as the scholar of the revival.

Revival's Influence.—In Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island the public school renaissance continued to flourish, handsome and unabated, even after the passage of Mann and Barnard. Manned in the main by capable fellows, the state boards gradually became more puissant. By the immemorial weapons of inspection and supervision, and the distribution of state subsidy, the business of education was kept pitched on a high plane. By 1876 the district-school miasmas had grown extinct in numerous spots. Hordes of private academies had folded up and gone out of business. In their place the public high school burst forth. In the other New England domains the revival marched with a slower tempo, but by the end of the reform period Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire had succumbed to the idea of state centralization and free secular schools.

Before Mann started on his grand crusade in 1837, New York, I am inclined to believe, was the most advanced state in education in the whole Republic. As early as 1784 the New Yorkers had installed the machinery of state school centralization. This was when the legislature created the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York for the purpose of organizing and developing public education beyond the elementary *niveau*. As I have already set forth, [5] the New York statesmen had frequently thrust open the state vaults to hand out gold among those towns and counties that lusted to develop their elementary schools. In 1812 New York appointed the original school superintendent of America. Eight years later, however, for reasons political, the unfortunate fellow was cashiered. Despite all these and other high doings, there was, however, the usual vitriolic opposition to public education. The ructions in the city of New York engendered by the distribution of public moneys to the Public School Society, the subsequent cancellation of this dubious practice, and the resultant establishment in 1842 of the New York City board of education, I have already related in detail.[6] About a decade after the birth of the city board, the Public School Society went out of the educational business and turned most of its assets over to the city. The steady and rapid growth of the public-school idea, it appears, had made the work of the Society unnecessary. Before the Society's demise, the apostles of better teacher-training brought into being the first state normal school founded at Albany in 1844. Ten years later the state superintendency was re-established. In 1867, however, came the biggest blast of all. This was when elementary education was made completely free throughout the whole New York realm.

---

[5] *Cf. p.* 207

In the other midland states public education traversed virtually the same route as in New York. In Pennsylvania the combat raged around the so-called permissive education laws, which made school taxation not mandatory but optional in accordance with the will of the local authority. In 1849 the permissive provision was laid in its grave. By the end of the revival epoch, Pennsylvania had adorned itself with a complete system of public schools. The same holds for New Jersey. But Delaware, it appears, continued to lag behind. Not until after the Civil War did Delaware accept the idea of a state system of free education.

---

[6] *Cf. p.* 208

What holds for the Middle States is also true in essence for the Middle West. Here the same obstacles to public education were encountered as in the rest of the land. In addition there was also the difficulty of arousing a pioneer populace, who didn't give a whoop for learning, and who, to make matters worse, were widely scattered in the backwoods. In the case at bar the experience of Indiana, I suspect, is typical. Here the chief leader and *agent-provocateur* of the public school was the eminent Caleb Mills. Like the other zealots of the revival, Mills launched a relentless campaign for free and secular schools. As a result of his incessant drumfire, the Indiana law-givers ordered in 1848 a public referendum on the question of free and tax-supported schools. The victory in this case was won by the protagonists of the public schools. The next year the Indiana members of parliament turned out a school law authorizing counties, who felt thus inclined, to vote school taxes. Even then, at the discretion of the township trustees, private schools were allowed to share in the public school gold. The highroad to public education was indeed long and rough. By the outburst of the Civil War, however, the revival had got in its heavy swings and a complete system of public schools was in operation.

South of the Potomac the magic of the revival also heaved its spell for a time. From 1840 on, a number of educational *prominenti* began to intone hosannas for public education. Their technique at bottom was of the same pattern as that employed in other sectors of the Republic. By 1850, however, the slavery issue overshadowed all other public questions, and hence down to the blood-letting of the Civil War not much progress in public education can be reported.

Up from the Civil War.—As the nineteenth century swung to its end every state in the Union was graced by a system of public schools. State centralization had become the accepted pattern. Localities, however, had plenty of home rule. Education was to be free, universal, and compulsory. More. Educational opportunity was to be made as broad as possible. *Ergo,* the American educational ladder which provides a continuous, articulated education from the kindergarten through the higher learning. With the exception of some of the more ancient states in the East, virtually every state in the land now has a state university where the higher learning is on free and lavish brew. Unlike some of the European lands, the United States, through its Federal Constitution doesn't attempt to regulate education throughout the whole country. Indeed the word *education,* like the word *God,* is carefully left out of that precious document. There is, however, the United States Bureau of Education. Its main mission, it appears, is to collect, compile, and scatter educational information. In addition the Bureau carries on investigations and research. The Bureau, moreover, has some definite administrative functions. Thus it approves the allotment of funds to the so-called land-grant colleges. Finally, it throws its spell into Alaska where it oversees the education of the natives. Compared with the powers of a first-rate European ministry of public instruction, as that of France, for example, those of the Bureau fade into vapor. To effect greater national pressure in the educational arena, a movement has been launched to create a Federal secretary of education with the usual chair in the presidential cabinet. Thus far, however, despite much lobbying and the heated support of batallions of prominent American educators, the secretarial post is still uncreated. Its main adversaries are the private and denominational schools who see in the proposed office the shades of a centralized bureaucracy that will inevitably imperil their present status.

Chapter Eleven

ITALY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STATE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.—Slightly more than a decade before modern Italy burst upon the world, the Kingdom of Sardinia laid the cornerstone of the peninsula's latter-day educational structure. This occurred in 1859, when the famous Casati Law was put into the tomes of law. With the subsequent establishment of the Kingdom of Italy, the clauses of the Casati regulation were extended to the whole peninsula. They were clearly an echo from France and prepared the way for educational centralization in Italy which in rigor and structure is on a par with that of the French Republic. Briefly, the Casati law required each commune to have at least two schools—one for boys and one for girls. School attendance after the age of six was required. On the whole, however, the law, though it threatened with fines, was poorly enforced.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN 1914.—Before the Duce's rise to the heights, compulsory school attendance was no more than a fable with the usual moral. True, there was the Law of 1827 which required youngsters between the ages of six and ten to go to school if they failed to pass certain prescribed examinations. But even here there were plenty of loopholes. Prewar elementary education was offered in a four-year course. The curriculum traded in the standard three R's. In the upper grades, the pupil was familiarized with the secrets embalmed in geopraphy, history, current events, and the simple elements of the natural and physical sciences. Religious instruction was under the ban, having been abolished in all state schools by the Law of 1905. Compared with the schools of her neighbors, those of prewar Italy shed no particular glow. All along the line there was a heavy emphasis on the plucking of knowledge. Little attention was bestowed on cultural and liberal subjects. And on top of it all, even the scanty curricular meal that was served up, didn't reach all the young Italianos because of the lax enforcement of compulsory education.

Prewar Secondary Education.—Prewar secondary education was of three main types—classical, technical, and normal. The classical lore was to be had in an eight-year school which was patterned on the standard classical lines found in most of the European lands. Most of the classical schools were co-educational, and all of them charged fees. Counteracting the humanistic atmosphere of the classical schools, were the newer secondary schools without Latin and Greek, and also the technical schools. The latter sought to prepare their pupils for the lower civil service and commercial jobs. The classical tongues were not stocked. French was the usual substitute. In addition the student studied his mother tongue, geography, drawing, arithmetic, and accounting. As in nearly every other land, the practical nature of these courses made a big appeal. Out of this, I suspect, flowed the rising registration of the technical school. On completion of the three years at the technical academy many students entered a higher technical institute. Here they went through a four-year stretch, grazing in technical fields of various sorts, and taking courses that ranged from higher accountancy to land surveying. The third type of secondary school, as I have said, was the normal school. Here a three-year course was to be had. As might be expected, completion of this prepared the student for the pedagogue's career. Teachers of secondary school subjects, interestingly enough, received their training not in a normal school but at the university.

In all these prewar secondary schools it was the intellectual side of education that got the main stress. Mountains of knowledge had to be scaled, and to land at the top, hours of drill and cramming and examining had to be passed through. There were no games; no music was taught; and even the fine arts were gathering the dust. The main thing was to absorb facts, like a sponge, and to squeeze them out in the state quizzes.

THE NEED OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM.—Plainly, prewar Italian education was sadly out of step with the pedagogical rhythm of the day. As I have already hinted, its enforcement of compulsory education would have made the efficient Germans laugh themselves to death. Progressive Italian schoolmen, it is true, had for a long time been trying to down this educational monstrosity. The government had even rushed to their assistance with a state subsidy, and had summoned into being the *patronato scolastico,* whose chief goal in life was to exhort delinquent parents to dispatch their offspring to school. More libraries had been organized and centers had been established to provide free meals for poor children. Yet despite all these splendidferous lures, compulsory education was a sad joke. Out of this pathetic state sprang the high percentage of Italian illiteracy. In fact among the larger prewar European domains Italy in this respect was second only to the Russians. Of course, it is true, that following its unification, the new kingdom was faced with a gigantic job. Among its varied population there were many—particularly in the south—who were downright hostile to anything with an educational smack. To make such fellows crave learning was obviously no light task. To eliminate illiteracy the minister of education worked hard. Thus in 1916—when Italian education was already under the spell of the reformers—night schools and holiday schools were set up to meet the needs of at least 100,000 illiterate or semi-illiterate adults. But the problem at best is still unsolved.

THE GENTILE REFORM.—Current Italian education had its origin in the celebrated Gentile Laws of 1923. Appointed Minister of Public Instruction in 1922, Gentile was given unconditional powers by the Chamber. Armed with this excellent blunderbus, Gentile, with his assistant reformer, Lombardo-Radice, undertook the improvement of the Italian school system. By the *Legge Gentile* the monopoly of the state in education was to cease. Educational competition from the private academies was to be encouraged. The state, in fact, was even to facilitate the development of non-state schools. Naturally enough, there must have been many opponents to such a policy. In harmony with the Mussolini dictum that there can be no morals without religion, and that Italy is a Catholic domain, the Gentile Laws have restored religious instruction to the public elementary schools. Religion for Gentile, curiously enough, "is the foundation and complement of all elementary subjects." Today the symbols of state and church in the form of a portrait of the reigning Italian monarch and the crucifix bedizen the walls of every classroom.

The most significant advance of all, I am inclined to hold, was the formulation of a first-rate compulsory education law. In the era of the Fascist constabulary, this part of the Gentile measure, I daresay, may expect no leniency when it comes to enforcement. Italian education has been made much more flexible—both from the administrative as well as the instructional point of view. The old hobgoblin of Italian education—excessive bookishness—was led to the Fascist guillotine. Formative education and moral personality are to be the goals of Italian education. To get pedantry out of the schoolbooks, all texts were ordered to be given the bath of complete revision. Popular literature and folk traditions are to be stressed, and more attendtion is to be bestowed on hygiene and physical training.

The Gentile acts have been hailed by the esteemed Duce as the "most Fascist of the Fascist reforms." Before the trained savants of Mussolini cast their benificent serum into Italian education, things, it appears, were in a bad way:

> Schools have been poisoned by humanitarian pacifism, wars for democracy, improvident spending, and the Wilsonian Peace. . . . If we do not succeed in giving

> Italy a Fascist education, in a few years we shall have lost the battle, even if we have a navy, an army, and the restored finances of the State. Wars are won by men of conviction. . . . [1]

And thus:

> The canker of the scholastic regime that must be destroyed is the demagoguery that tries to suppress the sane and spontaneous sense of discipline to the authorities. [2]

No doubt the Fascist influence on Italian education is profound and esoteric.

MODERN ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.—Attendance at the elementary school is today compulsory though it is by no means entirely universal. In some communities compulsory attendance is enforced up to the age of fourteen—decidedly a step in advance. Divided into three cycles—preparatory, lower and higher—modern elementary education covers a period of eight years. The early stages of this type of schooling give simple instruction in singing, drawing, gymnastics, modeling, gardening, animal-raising, and, of course, religion. The work of the lower course is somewhat more formal though never as rigid as in the prewar days. Beside the required work in religion the pupil imbibes the mysteries of writing, reading, arithmetic, the metric system, oral translation from his local dialect into standard Italian, simple geography, in addition to what was taught in the preparatory course. In the higher cycle the student studies the work of the lower course in greater detail. In addition he also sheds his talents on the history of Catholic religion, besides being initiated into the dogma of Holy Mother Church. An attempt is also made to ram into the child a venerative feeling for the grandeur of Italy's past. In the higher grades the youngster also gets instruction in the elements of economics, advanced arithmetic, elementary science and geometry, hygiene and gymnastics. Hikes and excursions are frequently undertaken, and some attention is also given to a form of exercise and service somewhat similar to that of our Boy Scouts. Great stress is laid on drawing. A child, as a matter of fact, is usually required to illustrate all his written compositions. Students, moreover, are expected to keep diaries wherein they are supposed to record their daily academic experiences and impressions. After his third school year, the youngster is made to compose an illustrated theme in which he discourses on his observations and studies during the academic year.

---

[1] Codigonla, E. *Il problema dell' Educazione Nazionale in Italia.*

[2] *Ibid.*

Plainly, encyclopedic knowledge has little place in this modern type of elementary education. To the dismay of many educators the natural sciences seem to have been thrust into the background. To offset this lack of reverence a form of creative education has been submitted.

Modern Secondary Education.—Secondary education in Italy is now divided into three distinct varieties. There is in the first place the complementary school (*scuola complementare*), which complete in itself, is an educational dead-end street leading nowhere. Its object, as its name implies, is merely to complete the education of those who have no desire later to continue their studies. There is a three-year curriculum with instruction in the mother tongue, mathematics, the natural sciences, history and geography, a foreign language, drawing, bookkeeping, stenography and typewriting.

Another brand of secondary education is offered in the technical and normal schools (*instituti tecnici e instituti magistrali*). Preparing their students for certain professions, the technical schools offer an eight-year course divided into two halves. During the first four years the student is caressed with instruction in Italian, a foreign language, mathematics, history and geography, stenography and typewriting. The second half of the course is divided into two sections, one commercial and one agricultural. The former prepares the student for a commercial career, while the latter is for those who lust for the life of a surveyor. The curriculum in each case is of course adapted to the special needs of the students.

Aiming to prepare teachers for the elementary schools, the normal institute has a seven-year curriculum. This, too, is split into two halves of four and three years respectively. The lower half dishes up virtually the same academic meal as the technical institute, but with additions in the elements of music, the study of a musical instrument and choral singing. From the second year on Latin is studied. In the higher course work is given in the Italian language and literature, history, education, philosophy, physics, hygiene, the natural sciences, and more advanced work in the subjects studied during the lower course.

The third variety of secondary education is that given in the classical *ginnasi-licei* and the *licei-scientifici* (scientific lyceums). As before the war, the work at the classical school is still divided into two parts, the first five years being spent in the *ginnasio* and the remaining three in the *liceo.* The Latin lingo is compulsory throughout the eight years. Beginning in his second year, a student is made to study a modern language, and in the fourth year he must begin Greek. Beside this, the usual subjects are taught. In the upper classes some attention is now given to philosophy, political economy, chemistry, and the history of art. Offering a four-year course, the scientific school aims to reinforce the training of those students who intend to continue their studies in the Faculties of Sciences, and Medicine and Surgery. Here again Latin is in the curriculum, though the emphasis is not so strong. Modern languages are stressed, at least two being required. French, however, is no longer obligatory as before the war. Instead the student may now choose from French, German and English.

Although postwar secondary education has in several respects been improved, there still remain several prominent defects. A one-sided curriculum is the most glaring weakness of Italian secondary education. While modern secondary training offers the boy a much more varied and richer academic fare than did its unreformed predecessor, nevertheless the tinge of intellecualism has not yet been entirely eradicated. Latin is intrenched in the Italian secondary school curriculum of today more firmly than ever before. Nor has the examination system been repaired. Secondary education is unfortunate in that tradition is more deeply rooted in it than in the primary school.

THE LYCEUM FOR GIRLS.—Inaugurated for those girls who don't crave a higher education, the lyceum offers a three-year course. Its students usually emanate either from the classical gymnisum or from the lower course of the normal institute. In general, the girls receive the same instruction as the boys. Some elective work is given in housekeeping, music and musical instrument, singing and dancing. Practically no time is devoted to the natural sciences

THE HIGHER LEARNING.—In a state system of education as centralized as that of Italy the higher schools and the universities—while jealously guarding their traditional academic liberties—are nevertheless considerably influenced by the educational policies sponsored and adopted by the Ministry of Public Instruction. So sensitive are the filaments of centralization that a wave of educational reform as vast and engulfing as that of Gentile must of necessity affect even the higher citadels of learning. Therefore, it was not long before the reformers were to turn their attentive eyes to Italy's higher schools. And thus, for the first time since 1859, the entire educational system was reorganized.

Two problems snared attention. The first of these dealt with the excessive number of Italian universities; the other was concerned with the matter of university autonomy. Like Spain and France, Italy had more universities than it needed. Necessary before the days of Italy's unification, when the country was still divided into hordes of petty kingdoms and principalities, these houses of the intellect have remained until today, despite the disappearance of their original reason for being. To obviate this difficulty of excessive numbers the state divided the universities into three types. Today there are what are known as *state* universities for whose expenses the state makes direct provision. There are ten such universities, some of the more important ones being Bologna, Rome, Padua, Genoa, Palermo and Pisa. Subsidized universities form another group. Prominent institutions of this particular species are Parma, Florence and Milan, in addition to seven others. Finally there are the so-called free universities which are private institutions receiving no gold whatsoever from the government. The free universities are at Camerino, Ferrara, Perugia and Urbino. The chief effect of this classification is that the state undertakes to support only such schools that it deems essential to the government. Those left to shift for themselves, and even the more fortunate ones that are partially subsidized by the state, are of course faced with serious economic difficulties. In the long run, natural selection may be expected to solve this situation.

All univesities are self-governing in administration as well as in teaching. Legally, the various universities and their degrees possess the same standing. Their professors are state officials. All universities, moreover, grant degrees. However, to be permitted to practice a profession the candidate must undergo a state examination. Formerly an academic degree in itself was sufficient qualification for the professions. Now, however, an academic degree is merely a title.

HYGIENE AND PHYSICAL TRAINING.—As everywhere else in the Old World, the war has engendered a greater interest in health and well-being. Backward and rather reactionary in this respect, prewar education in Italy, as I have already stated, gave little thought to awakening sound habits of health and hygiene in the school child. Games, hikes and excursions had little part in the ordinary academic ritual. Physical training, whenever included in the curriculum, was hardly comparable to similar work done in other lands. Today, however, this situation is otherwise, and although Italy is still behind the more progressive nations, the peninsula has nevertheless accelerated its pace. The kindergartens, which in prewar days were considered charitable rather than educational institutions, do a great deal of their work in the open air. The elementary school has organized its work in physical training along progressive lines. It is in the secondary schools, however, that the most radical reforms have been undertaken. Here conditions were so unwholesome and so antiquated that the reformers, unable to grapple with the situation as it existed, were constrained to create an entirely new set of machinery. By a royal decree in March, 1923, physical training was removed from the secondary school entirely and put in charge of the National Organization for Physical Education (*Ente Nazionale per l'Educazione Fisica*). Under the guidance of a university authority in education and hygiene, physical educational has now been put upon a brand new basis.

THE VATICAN AGREEMENTS.—On February 11, 1929 the illustrious Mussolini and the Papal Secretary of State flung their signatures on what has been recorded in the historical scrolls as the Political Treaty, Concordat, and Financial Agreement. This simple calligraphic experiment put an end to the fifty-eight-year-old Roman Question. In Articles 36 to 40 of the Concordat are embalmed the educational clauses. At bottom these are interesting. Thus in accordance with Section 36 "Italy considers the teaching of Christian doctrine, according to the form handed down by Catholic tradition, as the foundation and capstone of public education." Italy, hence, agrees "that the religious instruction now given in the public elementary schools shall be further developed in the secondary schools according to a program to be agreed upon by the Holy See and the State." Such lofty instruction, interestingly enough, is to be dispensed "by teachers who are priests or religious approved by ecclesiastical authority." They are to be aided in their great work "by lay teachers and professors holding for this purpose proper certificates to be issued by the diocesan Bishop." Should the reigning *episcopus* revoke the certificate, his action "immediately deprives the individual of the right to teach." No texts are to be adopted for religious instruction in the public schools without the official approval of the ecclesiastical authority. The remaining clauses of this lofty document deal in the main with higher education. All along the line they represent immense and strange concessions on the part of the Italian state to the Roman Catholic clergy.

Chapter Twelve

RUSSIA

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION.—Education in Russia is not graced by a continuous and progressive development. Much rather is it a series of heavings and fallings, of advances and retreats. Conspicuous in this irregular development of Russian education is its close attachment to the particular ideas of the throne of Russia. Fix your eyes on this hypothesis, and you will find that during the reign of an enlightened monarch there was usually some form of educational progress. With the advent of a reactionary ruler there was invariably some kind of educational retrogression.

The earliest impetus to education came through one of Russia's early men of vision, the estimable Peter the Great (1689-1725). So ardent was Peter's enthusiasm for learning that his private seal had engraved upon it the words: "I belong to those who seek knowledge and are willing to learn." Peter, however, was not satisfied with mere shibboleths. Quite properly he might be called the father of Russian public education, such as it was. It was during his reign that elementary schools as well as technical schools were organized. When Peter died there was almost one of each kind in every provincial town. It was during Peter's reign also that a naval and a clerical academy was organized and that the Academy of Sciences with an attached university and preparatory school was hauled into existence.

During the century that followed the reign of the great Peter only two Russian satraps showed any interest in the development of education. The enlightened Catherine II (1762-96) tossed off many theories concerning education. Believing that the most important step towards an improved system of education was the bringing up of a "new breed, or new fathers and mothers," Catherine gave extra heed to the education of girls. Thus it was during her reign in 1764 that boarding schools for young ladies were inaugurated. These institutions, while admitting the daughters of the ordinary citizenry, nevertheless had special classes for the daughters of the noblesse. The educational plan of 1782 is not without interest. By it there was provided a "main" public school in each government capital, a "small" public school in the smaller district seats beside four universities. Unfortunately, this scheme was shattered by a lack of money.

The next ruler to show more than a cursory interest in the development of adequate schools was Alexander I (1801-25), who through his rout of Napoleon did much to gild the prestige of Russia on the continent. Education was not only free, but in certain cases it even brought a small income. Thus the students of the higher schools received a small remuneration, and were considered state officials in the service of the crown. It is sad but true that the Russians were slow to appreciate the educational foresight of their more progressive rulers. Not until the end of Alexander's reign was there any change in this insensibility to education.

Alexander's successor, Nicholas I (1825-55) was not antagonistic to education. His educational policy at bottom was one of encouragement. Set, however, in an era when the third estate throughout Europe was protesting—sometimes with guns and blood-letting—against post-Napoleonic tyranny, general education was looked upon with suspicion. Not only in Russia but elsewhere on the continent it was felt that education might readily give birth to revolutionary ideas. Hence it was only natural that Nicholas—if for no other reason than self-defence—should have subjected education to stringent regulation. Despite his natural fears, however, Nicholas carried on the work of his predecessor. Throughout the Moscovite acres there was an unusual intellectual activity. Technical schools, military academies and teachers' colleges were opened at several places. Colleges for women were also established. Special secondary schools were founded for the children of the noble blood. Here the classics were introduced. Children of the merchants and the *bourgeoisie* had special schools but were discouraged from attending the classical schools of the nobles. Not to be denied, however, many of the commoners, to still their thirst for knowledge, found their way into these schools. Unfortunately, this made the governing classes uneasy and led to repressive measures. Fees began to be charged. University freedom of teaching, hitherto guaranteed, was abrogated. The teaching of philosophy was abolished. Military discipline was introduced in the universities and in the upper classes of the gymnasia. What further aggravated the situation were the various uprisings throughout Europe towards the middle of the nineteenth century. Towards the end of the reign of Tsar Nicholas I reaction was rampant.

With the coronation of Alexander II (1855-81), known to posterity as "The Emancipator," there begins what is known in Russian history as the epoch of great reforms. At the outset of his reign Alexander set aside the repressive educational measures of his predecessor. Students, however, were forbidden to organize corporations. This was also the time when secondary education was reorganized. Believing that the natural sciences were the cause of materialism and nihilism, the Minister of Public Instruction threw a halo around the nation's humanistic gymnasium. The so-called real or scientific *gymnasium* was converted into a "real school." Only graduates of the classical gymnasium were taken into the university. Beside these changes, steps were also taken to improve the education of girls. This in general was made less exclusive and more adaptable to the needs of girls in whose veins there flowed no noble blood corpuscles. In 1863 women's gymnasia for the training of women teachers were introduced. Several years later a medical school for women was organized. Beside this several women's colleges were established at St. Petersburg and other university towns. Finally, several squads of primary schools were opened throughout the country. Unfortunately, however, lower education got little attention, and thus Russian education during the last quarter of the nineteenth century was weakest where it should have been the strongest.

With the passing Alexander II another wave of reaction poured in, and up to the outbreak of the recent war against the Postdam Gang no startling educational improvements can be recorded.

ORGANIZATION OF PREWAR EDUCATION.—Tsaristic Russia, as might readily be surmised, had little patience with such a dangerous toy as local self-government. National authority, dominated by the absolute power of the ruler of all the Russians, was the fashion. Education, therefore, was a centralized affair under the control of the state—and the state, as everybody knows was the Tsar. At the head of the nation's centralized educational machinery was the Ministry of Public Instruction. A large number of schools, however, were administered directly by the Holy Synod. Last, but nevertheless quite important in its relationship to the schools, was the Ministry of Finance. The highest office in this educational bureaucracy was held by the Minister of Public Instruction. Appointed by the Tsar and subject solely to his imperial good will, the Minister was not annoyed by political fluctuations and parliamentary transformations. The Minister's control, moreover, was quite real. Subject only to the dicta of his imperial master, the Minister of Public Instruction held a very potent position.

To facilitate local educational administration the Moscovite Empire was divided into districts of which there were fifteen at the outset of the war. In each of these districts the schools—higher as well as lower—were in charge of a curator who was appointed by the Tsar upon the nomination of the Minister. Assisting the curator were a number of inspectors and directors. In the case of the church schools—of which there was a goodly number—the administrative authority was the synod with the bishop of the diocese functioning as a curator. These inspectors—lay as well as clerical—took their duties seriously. No one in the field of education was more cordially despised.

Prewar Elementary Education.—While all Russian schools were state-controlled, only a very few were state-maintained. Had it not been for the private initiative of the zemstvos [1] primary public education would have been downright impossible. The church schools, interestingly enough, were recipients of financial aid from the state treasury, but even they could not have existed had they not received additional funds locally. [2] Compulsory education was non-existent, slightly more than three per cent of the entire populace being in actual school attendance. [3] In the wake of this educational apathy there was, as might be expected, an astounding degree of illiteracy. Indeed, in this field, of the larger lands Russia was clearly the champion.

---

[1] In those provinces where local self-government existed, the zemstvos represented the organ of such government.

[2] In 1905 the Russian duma voted 10,000,000 rubles as an additional sum to the state's annual expenditures on education. Closely analysed, however, this expenditure is nothing more than a drop in the bucket.

[3] These figures were for 1904. For the same year the figures for America were 23 per cent; for Germany 19 per cent; for England 16 per cent; and for France 16 per cent. Cf. V. G. Simkhovitch, *Educational Review,* XXXIII, 520, 1907.

A higher and a lower school characterised Russian primary education. Of these the majority were lower schools. Free and co-educational, the lower primary schools offered a course which in some localities lasted three years, and in others four years. The school year in itself was of short duration. Even so, peasant children, compelled to work in the fields for their parents, rarely attended school during the full year. Classes, moreover, were large. Legally, the number of children in one class under a single teacher was fixed at fifty; actually, however, the number was often as high as seventy and sometimes it even reached ninety. Most of the elementary schools devoted their efforts to the teaching of the traditional curricular trio—arithmetic, reading, and writing. Some time was given to the fundamentals of geography and history. If the demand existed, instruction was also given in practical subjects such as gardening and needlework. Obligatory in all schools, religion in all its phases was taught by the local priest. In addition to this the young Russians were initiated into the mysteries of church singing, important prayers, the ten commandments, important parts of the Old and the New Testament and the creed. Only one examination was held throughout the entire lower course—when the child left school. And even this was usually not written but oral.

Probably the greatest boon to the boy's happiness lay not in his completion of the work required for graduation from the lower elementary school, but in the fact that the completion of this work reduced his term of required military service.

Higher primary education was restricted to boys. Usually on tap in the district and urban schools, the regular course generally comprised five or six years. Of these, the first two, however, were nothing more than a review of the work done in the lower primary school. The curricular fare was about the same as that of the lower elementary school. Religion was again required. The three R's were also present. In addition the pupil received instruction in Slavonic, elementary geometry, history and geography, penmanship, drawing, physics, and natural history. Sometimes commercial and technical subjects were also taught. Because of their location in the larger towns, the higher primary schools were practically inaccessible to the peasant children.

A word must here be said of the Russian teachers. In the elementary schools about two-thirds of the instructors were women. Their monthly salary was about thirty rubles—which in American cash before the war represented about fifteen dollars.[4]

---

[4] It must of course be remembered that the standard of living in Russia was considerably different from that of America. The Russian teacher, moreover, was unusually povided with rooms, "fires and lighting."

For every five years of service the state generously dug into its pockets to lift the teacher's salary five rubles a month. Never, however, was the teacher to draw more than fifty rubles a month. After twenty-five years of service teachers were entitled to a pension equal to their full salary, or about $300 a year.

Not all children studied in the free state elementary school. Those, however, who went to the synod school received virtually the same instruction as their brethren in attendance at the public school —though perhaps not in as capable a manner. The church school bestowed even more attention on religion, and especially to church singing and Slavonic. The teaching was generally done by the local gentlemen of God or by graduates from the clerical schools. Paid even less than their secular buddies, the pedagogues of the synod schools were usually less capable.

PREWAR SECONDARY EDUCATION.—Similar in a general way to the system of secondary education prevalent in the larger nations on the continent, that of Russia also shared at least one prominent defect, namely, the lack of connection with elementary education. Like the secondary schools of France and Germany, and several other European lands, those of Russia were designed for the élite. Unlike some of these nations, however, Russia placed only a trifing premium on the intellect. No matter how brilliant a peasant child might have been, its avenue to a full and adequate higher education was exceedingly limited.

The usual types of secondary schools existed. Thus, there was the gymnasium with its pro-gymnasium. Both of these were day schools under the Ministry of Public Instruction. In addition there were the "real schools" which, as has been explained, were an outgrowth of the scientific gymnasia, abrogated during the reign of Alexander II. These schools, too, were under the control of the Ministry of Public Instruction. Two other types of schools existed—the ecclesiastical schools and seminaries under the surveillance of the synod, and the cadet corps, which were board schools, kept and controlled by the War Office.

Maintained either by the state or by private initiative, the gymnasium and the pro-gymnasium charged fees—about fifteen per cent of the students being admitted free. Even though the gymnasium was seldom attended by the poorer classes, it was nevertheless not quite aristocratic enough for the children of the well heeled. These were usually sent to very exclusive private secondary schools which, needless to say, generally demanded very stiff fees. The larger part of the student body in attendance at the gymnasium was made up of the sons of professional people or of clerks in the civil service. Generally entering upon secondary education at the age of ten, the Russian boy was offered an eight-year course at the gymnasium and a seven-year course at the real school. At the gymnasium he studied religion, Russian, Slavonic, Latin, Greek, mathematics, physics, history, geography, either French or German, penmanship, drawing and logic. No classical languages were taught at the real school. Instead, however, the modern languages were compulsory. As usual, more time was consecrated to mathematics and physics and less to history and literature. In the upper classes, moreover, the students in certain real schools were allowed to elect commercial subjects.

Practically the same in their organization, the gymnasium and the real school were in charge of a director, appointed by the curator of the district. This director was in turn assisted by an inspector. It was customary for both the director and his assistant to take part in the teaching. Forming a sort of educational council, the entire staff of the school was accustomed to meet once a month for the purpose of discussing school questions of import. Appointed by the curator, the teachers were required to have a university degree or its equivalent. In the gymnasium the teacher's salary ranged from about 1800 rubles ($900) to 2200 rubles ($1100)— depending upon the number of hours taught. In the real school the pay was somewhat higher. Teachers employed in the state schools were looked upon as civil servants of the crown and were assigned a definite rank. Theoretically these pedagogues weren't expected to tote the musket, being exempt from military service. Like the teachers of the lower state schools, those of the gymnasia and real schools were entitled to a pension after the completion of twenty-five years of satisfactory service.

Supported by funds collected locally, the ecclesiastical schools and seminaries were intended for children of the holy clerks. Such youngsters were admitted free, though provision was usually made for the admission of others who were, however, required to pay a fee. A six-year course preceded by four years of preparation was offered at the seminaries. Almost invariably this preparation was given at the ecclesiastical school. Students of the seminary usually took holy orders and then entered the ranks of the evangelical clergy. The more gifted seminarists were encouraged to continue their training at the ecclesiastical academy where they were got ready for the higher church positions. A few entered one of the three universities open to seminary graduates.[5] The curriculum of these religious secondary schools was rather similar to that of the gymnasium, although as might readily be expected, much greater stress was placed upon the holy subjects.

---

[5] These were Dorpat, Tomsk and Warsaw.

As the name implies, the cadet corps were military institutions intended especially for boys who craved to prepare for the military profession or for the more specialized work of the higher military colleges. A seven-year course was available. Very similar to that of the real school, the curriculum of these military schools closed its doors upon the classics. All the teaching, moreover, was done by the military brethren.

Of these various secondary schools the gymnasium alone qualified the student for the university, while a diploma from the real school opened the way to the higher technical schools. Graduation from either the gymnasium or the real school cut the term of compulsory military service to one year only.

PREWAR SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR GIRLS.—Divisible into three varieties, prewar secondary education for girls comprised institutes, gymnasia, and diocesan schools. Institutes were exclusive boarding schools offering a seven-year intellectual diet to the daughters of the *haute monde*. Gymnasia were day schools, supported by the state or by private persons. Open to all classes, but appealing especially to the well-to-do middle class, the gymnasia offered a seven- or eight-year course. The diocesan schools were day schools offering a seven-year course for daughters of the clergy. These academies were, however, open to other students. Like the seminaries and the ecclesiastical schools for boys, the diocesan schools were supported chiefly by funds raised locally. Graduation from any one of these three schools entitled one to teach in the primary schools. To teach in the secondary schools, a girl was required to have plucked a higher education. On the whole, the curriculum of the girls' schools was similar to that of the boys' institutions. One salient difference is to be noted in the absence of the classical disciplines. Some time was also given to such special subjects as needlework, education, etc. Beside these general types of secondary schools there were also several others wherein provision was made for special education. Prominent among these were schools for the training of primary school teachers and medical schools designed to prepare doctors' assistants.

PREWAR TECHNICAL AND COMMERCIAL SCHOOLS.—Towards the end of the Tsaristic regime provision for technical and commercial schools—though quite inadequate—was nevertheless increasing. Thus there were some 200 schools offering a three- or four-year course for the training of artisans. These schools, however, were not state-supported. In general they were open to adults who had worked in a factory for at least two years and also to boys between the ages of eleven and fifteen who had completed the regular primary course. There were also a few higher technical schools intended for the training of engineers and chemists. Such schools were open only to the graduates of the real schools or the gymnasia.

With only two exceptions the commercial schools were under the sway of the Ministry of Finance. They were, however, supported by local funds and for this reason were as independent as any school might reasonably have been expected to be during the old regime. Four kinds of commercial schools existed: (1) commercial schools, (2) business schools, (3) business classes, (4) courses in commercial knowledge. Commercial schools offered a seven-year course and did practically the same work as the real school. It was only during the last two years that the student was initiated into the hidden secrets of commerce. Such seven-year academies were intended especially for those students who expected to enter the technical higher school. The so-called business *schools,* however, were designed to train clerks and office workers. Primary education was a pre-requisite for entrance. A three-year course was offered. The hours, moreover, were arranged to meet the convenience of the students during business hours. Business *classes* were held at night. They were designed principally for office workers and were rather elementary and usually non-technical. The most advanced type of commercial instruction was offered in the courses in commercial knowledge. Intended primarily to train teachers of commercial subjects, these courses gave advanced instruction in special fields. They were open only to persons having a secondary education.

THE PLIGHT OF PREWAR EDUCATION.—Despite outward appearances prewar education was anything but excellent. It is true that Russia had a centralized school system which in many respects had all the touches of efficiency. Yet upon closer examination the greater number of the more commendable elements of Russian education vanish, and nothing remains but the rusty remains of antiquated machinery. Thus, the departed empire made provision for elementary education; yet its provision never carried with it the mandate of enforcement. There were secondary schools—but only for a selected few. This chasm between primary and secondary education was worse in effect than in France and Germany; for in both of these two nations primary education was at least effective enough to grapple with the bugaboo of illiteracy.

In Russia, as I have said, this flourished. It has been said, as a matter of fact, that "the Imperial Government, far from trying to stimulate educational activities, did everything in its power to hamper the work of enlightenment." [6] Russian education was the embodiment of the principle formulated by the Minister of Education Shishkov during the reign of Alexander I—"To teach the mass of people, or even the majority of them, how to read will bring more harm than good." Beside being shackled to an inefficient, antedeluvian educational dead-weight, Russian education was securely pilloried to clericalism. The fact that the primary school devoted more time to the study of religion than to that of writing and arithmetic speaks eloquently for a distorted curriculum. In one matter, however, the officers of the Tsar were thoroughly efficient. Privy to all the intracacies of bureaucracy, and trained, moreover, in all the fine details of espionage, the swarms of government inspectors left nothing undone to see that the imperial instructions were enforced to last jot and tittle. Thoroughly hated, these ministerial inspectors were amongst the first to go when the worn-out educational machine of old Russia was dismantled.

EDUCATION IN SOVIET RUSSIA.—When the lamented Tsar Nicholas II took his final curtain call in 1917, the Bolsheviks, as everyone knows, started in to improve the world. With the advent of Lenin and Company, and the passing of a few revolutions and famines, the old educational conditions gradually changed. Not only were the school gates hoisted high so that everyone could now pass through, but the whole avenue to learning was dug up and freshly paved. Naturally enough, the materials employed in this job were strictly communistic. Education, in actual fact, became the lime and cement of the whole Soviet structure. At bottom the Soviet educational formula is not at all occult. Baldly stated by the Russians themselves, it comes in four main parts. For the rising communists education is to mean (1) active participation in the building of their own lives; (2) stress upon socially useful labor; (3) establishment of intimate connections with contemporary life; (4) the study of nature and the development of a materialistic outlook. The communist educational savants have today an educational ladder which at least in the Old World is beyond compare. For youngsters under three there's a nursery. Then up to the age of eight come the kindergarten and other pre-school institutions. Following on the heels of the kindergarten period comes the primary school. This covers the years eight to twelve. At the age of twelve the educational highroad divides into four branches. Thus there are available the school for peasant youth, the school of working apprenticeship, the vocational school, and the first division of the secondary school. The latter leads into the second division, which the pupil enters at fifteen. The other three cradles of the intellect lead to the technicums. For ambitious students of seventeen years or above, the universities and the higher learning are available. In addition there are research institutes whose work, however, is for mature and advanced scholars.

---

[6] Pasvolsky, Leo: Educational under Communism, *Educational Review,* LXII, 210, 1921.

The communists have also thrown considerable attention on the problem of adult education. For the grown-ups several disciplines are available. Most important of all, I suspect, is the school for the liquidation of illiteracy. True to its name, this academy aims to turn out literate Russians. Thus far, it has been working at full pressure, and has actually been turning out a magnificent job. In addition to the schools for literacy, the devotees of the communistic rite have several adult schools dedicated to vocational education, and to what is known as a cultural-political education.

Thus the educational structure in its essence. What has it accomplished in the way of net results? Well, in the first place it is compulsory and non-clerical. For another thing, it is based in many of its elements—outside of the Marxian rumblebumble—on the most advanced pedagogical thought of the day. Thus there is considerable stress on the pre-school era. On the other hand, the adult comes in for his share of training. Textbooks, as one might expect, have been thoroughly overhauled and revised to harmonize with the communistic wisdom. The Russian alphabet has come in for inspection and change. By the elimination of a few needless letters, the whole business has been simplfied, and hence spelling has been made easier. Most important of all, I daresay, is the vast stress given to health and hygiene.

Yet Russia must be viewed realistically and under the glass. And here the situation metamorphoses. The air is still heavy with theory. At bottom this is easy to explain. For one thing, like everywhere else, it takes an immense bag of gold to put the theory of Russian education into actuality—and money, as is well known, is not abundant in the Moscovite domain. For another thing, the Russians have been forced to concentrate on other things than education. The struggle for survival—political, economic, and industrial—has been and is the communists' biggest and most important problem, and hence it has got the main stress. Whatever has been done educationally has flowed out of the larger and more significant matter. Russian education today, despite the beauteous babblings of college philosophers and Greenwich Village Brahmins, is not free. No education that slams the minds of children shut to doings other than those accepted by their rulers can be called free. Free modern education, unlike in the Soviets, Italy, and some of the backwash districts of our own Republic, means the right to study anything and everything—without interference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL

Cubberley, E. P., *The History of Education; Readings in the History of Education;* Duggan, S. P., *A Student's History of Education;* Graves, F. P., *A History of Education;* Learned, W. S. *Quality of the Educational Process in the United States and Europe;* Monroe, P., *Textbook in the History of Education;* Parker, S. C., *The History of Modern Elementary Education;* Quick, R., *Educational Reformers;* Roman, F. W., *The New Education in Europe;* Sandiford, *et al.*, *Comparative Education.*

Other invaluable reference works containing material in the history of education are the *Cyclopedia of Education*, the *Educational Yearbook*, and *Die erziehungswissenschaftliche Forschung* (*pädagogische Gesamtbibliographie*), published by Kurt Stenger.

ROUSSEAU

Original Sources: *Confessions, Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, Discourse on Inequality*, the *Social Contract, Emile.*

Secondary Sources: Everything that has been written about Rousseau since 1905 is noted and reviewed in the annual *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau.*

BASEDOW

Original Sources: *Elementarbuch, Methodenbuch, Ausgewählte Schriften* (Göring, editor).

Secondary Sources: Basedow, A., *Johann Bernhard Basedow;* Diestelmann, R., *Johann Bernhard Basedow;* Duller, *Die Männer d. Volkes;* Lang, *Basedow: His Educational Work and Principles.*

PESTALOZZI

Original Sources: *Evening Hour of a Hermit; Letters on early Education, Leonard and Gertrude, How Gertrude Teaches her Children, Sämtliche Werke,* 10 vols., edited by Bachenau, A., Spranger, E., and Stettbacher, H.

Secondary Sources: Guimps, R., *Pestalozzi: His Aim and Work;* Pinloche, A., *Pestalozzi and the Foundation of the Modern Elementary School;* Sheldon, E. A., *The Oswego Movement; Pestalozzi and his Times—A Pictorial Record,* edited by the *Pestalozzianum* and the *Zentral Bibliothek* of Zurich.

HERBART

Original Sources: *Sämtliche Werke,* 19 vols., edited by Kerbach, K., Flügel, O., Fritzsch, T. *Science of Education. Outlines of Pedagogy, Textbook in Psychology.*

Secondary Sources: De Garmo, C., *Herbart and the Herbartians;* Herbart Society, *Yearbook i, ii;* Ufer, C., *Introduction to the Pedagogy of Herbart.*

FROEBEL

Original Sources: *Autobiography, Education by Development, Education of Man, Mother Songs, Pedagogics of the Kindergarten, Songs and Music of Motherplay.*

Secondary Sources: Barnard, H. (ed.), *Kindergarten and Child Culture;* Boardman, J. H., *Educational Ideas of Froebel and Pestalozzi;* Bower, H. C., *Froebel and Edu-*

cation by Self-Activity; Hailmann, W., *Kindergarten Culture;* Payne, J., *Froebel and the Kindergarten;* Peabody, E., *The Kindergarten.*

SPENCER

Original Sources: *Autobiography*, *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical.*

Secondary Sources: Gaup, O., *Herbert Spencer;* Royce, J., *Herbert Spencer: An Estimate and a Review.*

GERMANY

Alexander, T., *Prussian Elementary Education;* Alexander, T. and Kandel, I., *Reorganization of Education in Prussia;* Alexander, T. and Parker, B., *The New Education in the German Republic;* Nydahl, J. (ed.), *Das berliner Schulwesen;* Paulsen, F., *German Education; The German Universities;* Russel, J. E., *German Higher Schools;* Thwing, C. F. *American and German Universities.*

FRANCE

Arnold, M., *Popular Education in France;* Farrington, F. E., *French Secondary Schools; Public Primary System of France;* Kandel, I., *French Elementary Schools; Reform of Secondary Education in France;* Siegfried, A., *France, A Study in Nationality.*

ENGLAND

Adamson, J. E., *Outline of English Education;* Bell, A., *An Experiment in Education;* Lancaster, J., *British System*

of Education; Improvements in Education; Meikeljohn, J. M., *An Old Educational Reformer, Dr. Andrew Bell;* Horwood & Hope, *Higher Education of Boys in England;* Salmon, D., *Joseph Lancaster;* Yeaxlee, B., *Working Out the Fisher Act.*

UNITED STATES

Atkinson, W. P. A., *Life and Works of Horace Mann;* Cubberley, E., *Public Education in the United States;* Dexter, E. G., *History of Education in the United States;* Hinsdale, B. A., *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival;* Horn, J. L., *The American Public School;* Kandel, I., *Twenty-five Years of American Education;* Knight, E. W., *Education in the United States.*

ITALY

Schneider, H. W., *Making the Fascist State;* Villari, Luigi, *Italy.*

RUSSIA

Nearing, S., *Education in Soviet Russia;* Pinkevitch, A., *The New Education in the Soviet Republic;* Wilson, L., *New Schools in Russia.*

INDEX

Academy inspector, 161
Advanced primary school, 163
Association for the Scientific Study of Education, 87
American Journal of Education (Barnard), 225
Annual Reports (Mann), 221
Aufbauschule, 143

Barnard, Henry, 223 f.
Basedow: Early life, 27; early education, 28; university study, 29; private tutor, 30 f.; Soroë, 32; Altona, 33; Address to Philanthropists, 34 f.; *Methodenbuch, Elementarwerk,* 36; *Philanthropinum,* 37 f.; Basedow s pedagogy, 40; influence, 41
Bell, Andrew 177 f.
Berlin, University of, 128
Blankenburg, 97
Blow, Susan, 107
Bodmer, 45, 48
Breitinger, 45
British and Foreign Society, 178
Bülow, Baroness v., 99
Bureau of Education (U.S.), 231
Burgdorf, 59 f.

Catherine II., 249
Christian Brothers, 149, 157
Code of 1763, 123
Code of 1765, 123
Code of 1794, 125
Clinton, De Witt, 213
Collège, 150 f., 164 f.
College of William and Mary, 205
Comenius, 41
Continuation Schools (Germany), 139
Concordat, (France), 149; (Italy), 244
Cousin, Victor, 70, 154
Culture Epochs Theory, 85 f.

Dewey, John, 90
Diderot 7, 24
Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, 6
Discourse on Inequality, 6
District school, 203
Dysli, 59, 66

Education (Spencer) 113 f.
Education of Man, 97
Elementarwerk, 36
Eliot, Charles W., 117
Emile, 7, 9 f., 49, 51
England: Late development of secularized education, 172; charity school system

174; Sunday schools, 176; Lancaster and Bell, 177 f.; the monitorial system of instruction, 179; influence of the monitorial system, 180 f.; infant school, 182 f.; early nineteenth century, 184 f.; Elementary Education Act of 1870, 186 f.; Education Act of 1902, 188; elementary education in 1914, 188 f.; secondary education in 1914, 190 f.; Fisher Act of 1918, 192 f.; up from the Fisher Act, 195; the higher learning, 196.

Erinnerer, Der, 48

Evening Hours of a Hermit, 52

Federal aid, 212

Fellenberg, 67

Fichte, 54, 70, 75, 76

Fisher Act, 192 f.

Formal discipline, 110 f.

France: Early nineteenth century, 148; Napoleonic influence, 149 f.; reaction under Louis XVIII, 152; progress under Louis-Philippe, 152 f.; Law of 1833, 154; up to the Third Republic, 155; educational reforms of the Third Republic, 156; organization of French education, 156f.; elementary education 161; advanced primary schools, 163; secondary schools, 164; secondary education for girls, 165; postwar education, 166; the higher learning, 169

France, University of, 151

Frauenschule, 139

Frederick the Great, 122 f., 125

Frederick William I, 121

Frederick William II, 124

Frederick William III, 126

Frederick William IV, 131

Froebel: Early life, 91 f.; training and education, 93; from surveyor to schoolmaster, 94; Yverdon, 95; Berlin, army, Institute, 95 f.; Burgdorf, 97; Blankenburg, 97; last years, 99; Froebel's pedagogy, 100 f.; Kindergarten, 102; influence, 104; manual training, 105; influence outside of Germany, 106.

INDEX

General Pedagogy, 76
Gentile reform, 236
Germany: Beginnings of public education, 121; Frederick the Great, 122; the *Oberschulkollegium,* 124; Code of 1794, 123; reform after Jena, 127; reaction, 130 f.; period of nationalism, 132; prewar elementary education, 134; prewar secondary education, 135; girls' secondary schools, 138; some other-prewar schools, 139; German constitution, 142; religious question, 143 f.; some contemporary schools 145; the higher learning, 146
Gewerbeordnung, 140; gifts (Froebel), 98
Green, J. A., 58
Grundschule, 143, 145
Gymnasium, 133, 136 f.

Hall, G. Stanley, 86
Harris, W. T., 107
Herbart: Early life, 73; Jena, 74; private tutor, 75; Göttingen, 76; Königsberg, 77 f.; educational principles, 79; interest, 80; apperception, 81; formal steps, 82; correlation, 83; followers of Herbart, 85; Pestalozzi and Herbart, 87 f.; influence, 88
Herbart Society, 87
Herder, 39
Helvetic Society, 48
Hofwyl, 67
Horne, Herman H., 118
How Gertrude Teaches Her Children, 57, 60
Humboldt, W. von, 128

Infant schools, 162, 182 f., 213 f.
Infant School Society, 184
Italy: Development of a state system of education, 232; elementary education in 1914, 232; prewar secondary education, 233; need of educational reform, 235; Gentile reform, 236 f.; modern elementary education, 238; modern secondry eduaction, 232 f.; lyceum for girls, 242; the higher learning, 243; hygiene and physical training, 245; Vatican agreements, 246

Jefferson, Thomas, 210

INDEX

Kant, Immanuel, 7, 39, 74, 78

Lancaster, 177, 213
Law of 1642 (Massachusetts), 200
Law of 1647 (Massachusetts), 211
Leonard and Gertrude, 53
Locke, John, 116
Louis XVIII, 152
Lycée, 150 f., 164 f.

Mädschenschulen, 138,
Mann, Horace, 218 f.
Manual training, 105 f.
Mayo, Charles, 184
Methodenbuch, 36
Mittelschule, 135, 146
Monitorial system, 179 f., 212
Montaigne, 116
Moving school, 202, 203

Napoleon I, 150 f.
Napoleon III, 155

Oberlin, J., 162
Oberrealschule, 134, 136 f.
Oberschule, 136
Oberschulkollegium, 134
Occupations (Froebel), 98
Ordinance of 1787, 212
Oswego Movement, 71
Owen, Robert, 182

Peabody, Elizabeth, 107
Pennsylvania Society, 211
Pestalozzi: Early life, 44 f.; early education, 46; law, 47; Neuhof, 49; the *Emile* influence, 49 f.; early writings, 52; *Leonard and Gertrude*, 53; Stanz, 54 f.; Burgdorf, 59 f., Yverdon, 61; Pestalozzian contribution, 62 f.; Fellenberg, 67; Pestalozzian influence, 68 f.
Peter the Great, 248
Philanthropinum, 37, f.
Primary school inspector, 160
Public schools, English, 188
Public school revival, 215
Public School Society, 204 f.

Raikes, Robert, 176
Realgymnasium, 135 f.
Realschule, 134
Recitation, formal steps, 82
Reformschule, 137
Rein, Wilhelm, 86
Robinson Crusoe, 16, 85
Rousseau: Early life, 3 f.; writings, 5 f.; nature is right, 7 f.; *Emile* 9 f.; *Sophie*, 21; inconsistence, 22; influence

INDEX

Russia: Development of education, 248 f.; organization of prewar education, 252; prewar elementary education, 254; prewar secondary education, 257 f.; prewar secondary education for girls, 261; prewar technical and commercial schools, 262 f.; plight of prewar education, 264; education in the Soviets, 265 f.

Salzmann, 42 f.
Schelling, 75
Schlegel, 93
Secondary Schools, England, 190 f.; France, 164 f.; 167 f.; Germany, 133, 135 f.; 147; Italy, 233 f.; 240 f.; Russia, 257 f.
Sheldon, E. A., 71
Simultanschule, 144 f.
Social Contract, 7, 20
Sophie, 21
Spencer: Life, 111f.; *What Knowledge is Most Worth,* 113; principles of education, 115; influence, 117.
S. P. C. K., 175 f.
Stanz, 54 f.
Studienanstalt, 139
Syllabaries, 65

United States: Religious motive, 196; Puritans, 198; early interest in education, 199; Massachusetts Law of 1642, 200; Law of 1647, 201; decline of New England education, 202; education in the Middle Colonies, 203; education in Virginia, 204; transitional period, 206; public money to private schools, 206 f.; sectarianism, 208 f.; obstacles to public education, 210; movements favorable to the development of public education, 212 f.; foreign influences, 216; public school revival, 217; Horace Mann, 218; Henry Barnard, 223; revival's influence, 226; up from the Civil War, 230.

University, Berlin, 128
  Cambridge, 196
  of France, 151
  Harvard, 199
  Oxford, 196
  of the State of New York, 207

INDEX

Virginia, 210

Volksschule, 134 f.
Vorschule, 135
Voltaire 7, 23, 138, 148

William II. (Germany), 133

Yverdon, 61 f., 95

Zedlitz, Baron, 124
Zeller, 69, 70, 129
Ziller, 84 f.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01379 2223

Date Due

FACULTY
FACULTY
S 27 '45
O 4 '45
O 24 '45
N 7 '45
N 21 '45
FACULTY
O 22 '46
N 5 '46
N 3 '47
RESERVE
(Brit) Hist. of Ed
OC 17 '49
AP 10 '51
[redacted]